Planning Applications Committee Report

ERECITION OF CIRCA 350 BED HOSPITAL, STAFF RESIDENCES, ENERGY CENTRE, FORMATION OF NEW ACCESSES, ACCESS ROAD AND INTERNAL ROAD NETWORK, FORMATION OF HELIPAD AND CAR PARK (980 SPACES INCLUDING DISABLED PARKING), LANDSCAPING AND ANCILLARY DEVELOPMENT AT LAND AT GARROCH FARM, GARROCH LOANING, CARGENBRIDGE, DUMFRIES

Application Type: Planning Permission in Principle

Applicant: NHS Dumfries & Galloway Health Board   Ref. No.: 13/P/3/0030

Recommendation - Approve subject to the successful completion of a Section 69 legal agreement and conditions

Ward - Abbey

Hierarchy Type (if applicable) - Major

Case Officer - Patrick Hanna

1  BACKGROUND

1.1 Under the Scheme of Delegation, this application requires to be considered by the Planning Applications Committee because it is a Major development and Troqueer Landward Community Council have objected to the proposal as a statutory consultee and officers and minded to approve.

The application site
1.2 The application site comprises 20.4 hectares of land located some 4km south-west of Dumfries, adjacent to the Garroch roundabout of the A75 (T) Dumfries bypass. The site is bounded along the northern boundary by the U347n Glen Road and beyond to the A75. To the north-west lies the recently developed Kilnford Barns Farm Shop. The eastern boundary is adjacent to the Garroch Business Park, which contains a number of large and medium sized industrial operations. The DuPont Teijin Plant is sited to the immediate south-east, with the Cargen Tower beyond which is occupied by Dumfries & Galloway Council. Between the application site and the business park is Garroch Farmhouse and an associated business unit, housing Value Mark Furniture. These units are accessed separately from the main business park, by means of a private access along the north of
the eastern boundary. The boundaries to the south and west are both field boundaries, with fields beyond. To the south-west, the site is backclothed by West Hill and High Wood. To the west, contiguous with the application site boundary, is the Terraughtie House non-inventory designed landscape, with the Category B listed Terraughtie House some 400m distant. The site is within 200m of the Terregles Ridge Regional Scenic Area.

1.3 The site is predominantly agricultural land (18.3 hectares), comprising semi-improved pasture with some scattered broadleaved trees and hedgerows. The topography of the site is defined by a pronounced hillock located within the northern part of the site. There are no watercourses within the site, however, a small watercourse / field drain, known as the Terraughtie Burn (a tributary of the Cargen Water) bounds the south and south-east of the site. Access to the site is currently taken via a field gate to the north-east corner of the site.

The proposal
1.4 The proposal is for planning permission in principle for the erection of a new regional hospital to replace the existing Dumfries and Galloway Royal Infirmary (DGRI) at Bankend Road, Dumfries. The development would serve the whole of the Dumfries and Galloway region and will accommodate approximately 350 beds, with 30,000 inpatients and 100,000 outpatients annually.

1.5 The proposed building is intended to be delivered by the NPD (Non-Profit Distributing) funding model, which relies on private sector funding instead of public sector funding. This funding model has implications on the project, in terms of both timetabling and design. In terms of timetabling, should planning permission in principle be granted, NHS D&G (National Health Service Dumfries and Galloway) will submit an outline business case to the Scottish Government and open a bidding process for the detailed design and construction of the site. A preferred bidder would be selected in Autumn of 2014, with construction scheduled for commencement in Spring 2015, final handover in Autumn 2017, with hospital commissioning taking place until Summer of 2018 when the first patients would arrive. In terms of design, a ‘reference design’ has been submitted which is intended to rigorously test the floor space requirements and clinical adjacencies (i.e. the proximity of particular departments to others), along with the design aspirations of the site. The applicant has advised that, whilst it will be the selected bidder who would submit any future application for Approval of Matters Specified in Conditions, the reference design is not anticipated to be substantially amended.

1.6 The proposal includes the following:-
- new hospital building, of low rise design of no more than four stories in height, to accommodate 350 in-patient beds, with an internal floor space of 52,000sqm;
- formation of new access from an enlarged A75 / Garroch roundabout and realignment of the Glen Road;
- separate dedicated emergency entrance, and secondary goods and services access;
- 980 car parking spaces and 80 cycle parking spaces;
- a helipad;
- staff residences;
- a dedicated energy centre;
- landscaping, including extensive cut and fill operations to level the site, with retention / re-use of all material along eastern site boundary;
provision of SUDS scheme; &
off-site road infrastructure improvement works.

Hospital building
1.7 The proposed hospital building would contain the following key departments; A&E, Out of Hours GP, Out-Patients Department, Orthopaedics, Combined Assessment Unit, Imaging, Palliative Care, Oncology, Short Stay Unit, Theatres and Endoscopy, Critical Care Unit, Women’s Services (containing Maternity, Birthing, etc), and eight generic wards. The remaining wards are due to be accommodated in the existing Cresswell Maternity Unit, refurbishment of which is due to be completed by Summer 2019.

1.8 The reference design of the hospital building has been reached as a result of the individual department floor space requirements and the clinical adjacencies of these departments. This has resulted in a 'radial' or 'sundial' layout, containing three key zones or elements. The first element is the Treatment and Diagnostic Block, containing the main entrance, A&E, Out-Patients Dept, Theatres, Imaging, etc. This is broadly rectangular in footprint, punctuated with lightwells, and orientated with principal elevation to the north-east site entrance. This block is mostly arranged over three floors, with smaller areas of lower ground service accommodation, and variating monopitch roofs of approximately 19m in height. The second element is the In-Patient Accommodation Block, comprising the generic wards that radiate out from the core building around a central enclosed courtyard. Each arm is rectangular in form, and three storeys in height, with pitched roofs of approximately 20m in height. These units are stepped down into the sloping ground, such that the ridge height would be some 3m lower than the Treatment and Diagnostic Block. The third element is the Women and Children's Block, which is appended to the principal elevation of the main block, and based around its own internal courtyard. It would be two storeys in height with pitched roofs.

Access, parking and helipad
1.9 The existing A75 Garroch roundabout is proposed to be improved to accommodate a new spur to serve the hospital and the U347n Glen Road. The improvements involve the diameter of the roundabout being enlarged and the geometry of the existing three main spurs being adjusted. The existing route of the Glen Road would be realigned to a more southerly position, connecting to the new southern spur of the roundabout.

1.10 The site is proposed to be served by three vehicular accesses. The main access to the site would be via the A75 Garroch roundabout, leading by internal road network to main entrance drop-off and bus stop/s. A secondary and separate access is also proposed for blue light traffic and A&E drop-off direct from the Glen Road at the north-western corner of the site. A further secondary access is proposed for service and delivery vehicles, via the U350n Garroch Business Park public road, which would be managed to prevent regular use by non-authorised traffic. A total of 980 car parking spaces would be provided to serve the development.

1.11 A heli-pad is proposed to the north-western corner of the site, sited to be within close proximity of the A&E department.
**Staff residences**
1.12 The indicative proposal is to construct 104 single bedrooms for use by individual clinical (predominantly medical) staff.

**Energy centre**
1.13 The development would be served by a stand-alone energy centre, to be located to the south-east of the site and adjacent to the proposed secondary service access. The details of this building have not been provided at this stage, nor has any further information been provided on the proposed generating source. However, it should be assumed for the purposes of this planning permission in principle that there will be an associated chimney (this could be as much as 20m in height).

**Landscaping**
1.14 The existing site is characterised topographically by the hillock to the north of the site, and the proposed layout intends to utilise site levels to accommodate split levels between the Treatment and Diagnostics Block and the In-Patient Accommodation. The Main Entrance would sit at an indicative level of \(+20\)m, with this level being largely maintained to the south of the site \(+19\)m). The finished ground levels would slope down elsewhere, with indicative levels of \(+14\)m on the western boundary, \(+14.5\)m at the helipad, and \(+13\)m at the Garroch roundabout.

1.15 Four key landscaped areas are indicated; firstly, the waste material / spoil extracted from the levelling of the site would be used to form a landscaping bund along the eastern boundary; secondly, at the main entrance with a focal landscaping area to assist with wayfinding; thirdly, landscaped gardens between the three blocks of the In-Patient Accommodation Block; and finally, therapeutic gardens within the various internal courtyards. Extensive tree planting is shown across the site as part of the overall landscaping proposal.

**SUDS**
1.16 An indicative SUDS pond feature is proposed for the south-western corner of the site (the lowest part of the site) adjacent to the In-Patient Accommodation Block. This pond is proposed to provide attenuation before discharging into an existing outfall from the site to the adjacent Terraughtie Burn.

**Enabling works / contributions**
1.17 The applicant has proposed the following enabling works / contributions:
(a) Improvements to the A75 / Glasgow Road roundabout, the A75 / Edinburgh Road roundabout and the A75 / Lockerbie Road roundabout, or financial contribution to Transport Scotland towards the cost of upgrading or improving Dumfries by-pass section of the A75 trunk road.
(b) Pleasance Avenue / New Abbey Road public road junction. Indicative proposal for a new roundabout to replace the existing T-junction.
(c) Dalbeattie Road / Park Road public road junction. Indicative proposal to re-prioritise the junction.
(d) Park Road / New Abbey Road area. Indicative proposal to extend the existing cycleway.
(e) Financial contribution towards provision of bus service to the proposed hospital site, with equal or better service than the current service to the existing DGRI Bankend Road.

1.18 In addition, the original submission proposed provision of streetlighting along the Maxwelltown Cycleway. However, this has been superseded by SWESTRANS plans to carry out these works at an earlier date.

1.19 The red line indicating the application site boundary has been amended during the application to remove a small area of land that was disputed by a third party in terms of ownership.

Supporting Information
1.20 The following information has been submitted in support of the application, all of which are available to view on the ePlanning website:-

- An Environmental Statement, with associated technical appendices and non-technical summary, to assess the environmental impacts of the proposal in respect of planning context, access transport and traffic, air quality, ecology, geology soils and contamination, landscape and visual impact, noise and vibration, water environment, cumulative impacts, residual impacts, and construction management;
- Reference design plans and drawings, including conceptual drawings to demonstrate design evolution and critical adjacencies, photomontages / artists impressions, and emergency diversion routes plan;
- Access Statement (Accessibility Report);
- Design Statement (Achieving Excellence Design Evaluation Tool);
- Transport Assessment;
- Sustainability Statement;
- Site Waste Management Plan; &
- Addendum to Environmental Statement - Flood Risk Assessment

1.21 In addition to the above, a Pre-Application Consultation Report (PAC) has been submitted. This describes how two public exhibitions / drop-in sessions were held at the former Baker's Oven, Dumfries on 25 October and 22 November 2012, with one further display of the proposals in Stranraer Library on 14 November 2012. Approximately 300 people attended the events. The applicant also presented details of the proposal to the Nithsdale Federation of Community Councils on 6 November 2012. The comments received were recorded, and are responded to within the PAC Report. The Report notes that a large proportion of the comments received related to matters such as need for a new hospital and the advantages / disadvantages of single bed rooms, which required no amendments to the current proposal. Transport and parking issues are also noted to have featured large in the public comments. The PAC Report concludes that the detailed design will fully consider safe access for all types of public transport, private vehicles, cycles and pedestrians at the same time as considering disabled access requirements.

Site history
1.22 In September 2012, a Proposal of Application Notice (12/N/3/0005) was submitted for the development. At the same time, a scoping request under the Environmental Impact Regulations (Scotland) 2011 was submitted, and the Council's formal scoping opinion was published in October 2012.
2 CONSULTATIONS

2.1 Troqueer Landward Community Council: Objection.
(a) The Community Council believe that there will be an increased demand for housing within the immediate area of the hospital which will lead to development pressure within the important rural landscape in which it will be situated. The Community Council is concerned that the siting of the hospital may lead to inappropriate extension of Small Building Group status or other devices which may adversely impact upon what is a rural area with, to a large extent, low density dispersed residential occupation.
(b) The Community Council notes that 104 residences will form part of the development. It is the Community Council’s understanding that none of the proposed units in the reference design have been briefed specifically for family accommodation; nevertheless the Community Council think the impact on the local primary school of probable demographic shifts within the immediate area in the years following the development, should be given careful consideration.
(c) The Community Council notes that the unclassified roads, Carruchan Beeches and Moss Road, which connect the Dalbeattie Road A711 and the New Abbey Road A710 are important to the rural character and recreational amenity of the area. These minor roads which legitimately serve the needs of farm vehicles and domestic access are also enjoyed by walkers and cyclists, with a cycle route planned to cross from Islesteps via the Beeches road to the Moss Road. These roads will certainly be used inappropriately as a short cut from New Abbey to the new Hospital unless measures are taken to discourage this.
(d) Access to The Glen currently emerges on to the roundabout which adjoins the development site and which is scheduled for reconfiguration as part of the development. The proximity of the Glen to the proposed development raises a number of concerns. The Community Council feels it important that access for Glen Road residents be given significant priority in planning for the road network such that;
- if a T-junction (as suggested by existing proposals) on to the hospital access road is to be formed as the reconfigured Glen Road access, that a mini roundabout or other traffic flow measure be included in the design, in order that Glen Road residents do not become marooned while trying to negotiate the radically increased traffic flow into and out of the hospital,
- that Glen Road residents' shared access with 'blue light' traffic is given equal consideration with regard to safety and use,
- that parking controls are put in place on the Glen Road, as far as the A75 flyover bridge, in order that 'spill over' parking from the hospital complex does not lead to congestion and access issues for Glen Road residents,
- that the flight paths and approach altitudes for helicopters landing at the hospital complex be designed in such a way as to minimise hazard and noise pollution for residents within The Glen.

2.2 Heath and Safety Executive: No objections.
(a) The site falls partially within the consultation distance of a major hazard site, DuPont Teijin Films UK Ltd.
(b) The hospital buildings, classed as Sensitivity Level 4, will be sited outside the consultation distance boundary, with only car parking and landscaped areas associated with the hospital located within the outer zone.
(c) The staff residencies, classed as Sensitivity Level 3, and the energy centre, classed as Sensitivity Level 1, are both sited within the outer zone of the consultation distance boundary.
(d) When these development types are audited using the PADHI+ consultation, the response is that the Heath and Safety Executive does not advise against the proposed development.

2.3 Transport Scotland: - No objections, subject to conditions.
Trunk Road Operations
(a) No objections subject to conditions requiring the implementation of the proposed trunk road improvements (at A75 / Garroch Loaning, A75 / Glasgow Road, A75 / Edinburgh Road, A75 / Lockerbie Road) prior to the occupation of the development, the submission and agreement of a Travel Plan setting out proposals for reducing dependency on the private car, and the submission and agreement of a Traffic Management Plan to be submitted to and approved, to include details relating to (a) traffic management measures including accommodation works to manage construction traffic, (b) measures to minimise traffic impacts on existing road users, (c) details of temporary signage, and (d) details of construction vehicle routing.

Noise and Vibration
(a) Noise modelling has been undertaken to assess potential noise impacts in the operation of the proposed development. To establish the noise impacts of the scheme across the study area, calculations have been undertaken in accordance with the guidance contained within the Calculation of Road Traffic Noise (CRTN) and the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB).
(b) Based on the information provided within the ES Chapter on Noise, it is accepted that the operational traffic associated with the proposed development would have no significant impact on the trunk road network and its adjacent receptors in terms of Noise.
(c) Transport Scotland note the potential noise impact during the construction phase of the development has not been undertaken given that it is not possible at this stage in the design to fully characterise the construction method and therefore undertake an effective assessment. As such, the developer proposes to assess the impact of construction noise and vibration as part of the detailed planning application stage. This is acceptable.

Air Quality
(a) Transport Scotland note that the air quality modelling has considered "2018 without development" and "2018 baseline plus development" scenarios. Transport Scotland accept the report findings that the Air Quality impact associated with traffic generated by the development will be "negligible" adjacent to the site access road and the trunk road network. Transport Scotland note that construction traffic has not been considered in the air quality assessment given that it has been assumed the volumes of construction traffic in comparison with the total volume of traffic on the local road network will be low and short-term. While this may be the case, Transport Scotland would recommend that during the detailed planning application stage, the volume of construction traffic should be compared against the air quality screening criteria to confirm that construction traffic associated with the proposed development would not impact on local air quality.
2.4 **Council Strategy and Transportation Officer**:- No objections, subject to legal agreement.

**Modelling Methodology**
(a) A Modelling Methodology Overview report was prepared by MVA Consultants. It detailed the data collected and the modelling approach to be adopted for assessing the two sites (1 and 12). It was agreed that three reports would be prepared, a Transport Assessment (TA) for each sites (Site 1, Garroch, and Site 12, Summerfield) and a comparator report examining the relative merits of each site as identified by the TAs. The fundamental factor determining the process was the need to equitably compare the two chosen locations by the NHS.
(b) A series of junction turning counts were undertaken but no road side interviews (RSIs). The data collection was limited, despite MVA Consultant’s comments noted above, due to urgent timescales and the need for the Council to work in partnership with the NHS.
(c) Strategic growth in traffic levels is usually included in this type of modelling work. However, in order to establish a true comparison of the impacts of each site compared to the other, this growth was omitted. Committed developments were included, however. This was to ensure that any adverse impacts of proposals were comparable and not influenced by external traffic growth. This approach does lead to possible underestimates of the true network impacts but it is acceptable as a comparator.
(d) In any event, the modelling work for the emerging Local Development Plan includes this strategic growth and affords an opportunity to add more detail to the impact of site 1, in particular, at the A75 / Garroch Loaning junction. This modelling work demonstrates an additional impact at this location and is discussed below.
(e) The lack of RSIs lead to the reliance on observed count data in 2011 merging with historical data already in the model. The trip matrices were synthesized using matrix estimation and then the resulting assigned traffic flows calibrated and validated.
(f) Taking together the timescales, data collection, traffic growth, modelling estimation and its calibration / validation, it is clear the model is satisfactory for a comparator but as MVA Consultants point out, a pragmatic approach is required to the modelling results in their absolute sense. The Transport Assessment is heavily reliant on the modelling work and so statements in it must be viewed in the round, taking not just tabled figures but local knowledge of the operation of the town centre road network.

**Transport Policy**
(a) The many policy considerations at National level down to local level are described in detail. The fit with these is set out in the TA. This compares the existing site with the proposed Garroch site. It does not take into account the mitigation effect of any proposed access measures the Council has considered to relieve congestion to the south part of Dumfries - leading to a somewhat skewed comparison. (The table assumes Garroch site mitigations are in place but does not assume any Council mitigation for the south part of Dumfries is in place). Overall, this assessment is unduly favourable to the proposed site particularly when considering sustainable transport issues.

**Response to Transport Assessment**
(a) The TA recognises the modelling calibration / validation outcomes and evaluates the impact of predicted traffic flows using several methods for both completeness and sensitivity testing. This creates an “envelope” of outcomes within which it is prudent to plan:
• Observed traffic flows are factored according to the ‘before and after’ flows in the DRTM to provide predicted demand flows. This is likely to be towards the lower edge of the “envelope” and recognises any shortfalls in the modelling process.
• The actual DRTM modelled flows are used to represent demand flows. This is likely to be towards the higher edge of the “envelope” and takes the modelling process at face value.
• The development flows and observed flows are combined to represent demand flows (the layered approach). This is the conventional approach for a transport assessment of a single development.
• None of the above takes into account strategic growth but does take into account committed developments.

(b) The TA examines sustainable transport and its potential but does not make any adjustment to vehicle trip generation as a consequence. This is appropriate.

(c) The TA correctly identifies the site is outwith any reasonable walking distance and notes that unless bus services enter the site, it is possible bus stops on Garroch Loaning will be outwith the accepted walking distance (400m)

(d) The TA overestimates the potential for cycling. Cycling distances are claimed to be achievable within a 15min – 20min cycling time. This time frame in reality just reaches the town centre and is significantly less. The TA does not identify cycling mitigation measures. Nevertheless, there are good cycle links to the proposed site and the identified mitigation measures already agreed separately will encourage cycling:
• Extended street lighting on the Maxwelltown cycle route to complete the lit section up to Garroch Loaning. This is to be provided separately by SWestrans under one of their programmes.
• A cycle link from Broomlands along and across New Abbey Road to Park Road cycle path leading towards the Garroch site. This will complete a link to Troqueer and beyond to Georgetown.

(e) Public Transport at this location is recognised in the TA as being predominately bus transport. The Council has recommended a level of service which is the equal or better of the service to the existing hospital location be provided. The TA discusses bus access and acknowledges discussions are ongoing with SWestrans regarding the precise mitigations required. A fundamental requirement must be bus penetration to the “front door” of the hospital.

(f) The TA has examined in great depth the impact of private vehicle access to the Garroch site. The largest impacts of the Garroch site occur on the A75 bypass and its junctions. Extensive discussions took place with Transport Scotland to determine the level of impact and the mitigations required. These have been agreed with Transport Scotland. The impacts on the regional (Council) arms of these junctions have also been examined and determined as part of the trunk road mitigations. The assessment of the A75 / Garroch Loaning mitigation under the further scenario of the proposed Local Development Plan has been carried out in a similar way to the evaluation of the need for mitigation in the TA. Within the range of outcomes, a level of additional demand which may result in further modifications to the layout is noted. Transport Scotland will take a view on this but it is likely that uncertainty regarding strategic growth and development of land allocations in the LDP mean that this would be a consideration for subsequent LDPs.

(g) Whilst the main issue is the A75 / Garroch Loaning junction (i.e. the site access), there are various levels of mitigation identified at all junctions except the A75 / A780 “Little Chef”
junction. In these cases, the improvements will be required by Transport Scotland but, it is understood, they may accept a commuted sum instead at the three junctions on the A75 with the A76, A701 and the A709. This is on the basis that the disruption due to the construction outweighs the small improvement gained in reality compared with the modelled improvements.

(h) It is considered that the improvement to the A75 / A76 Glasgow Road are worthwhile in any event and a commuted sum for this should not be considered as an alternative. The other mitigations at the remaining junctions (including Council road arms) are minor and suitable for a commuted sum which could be put towards the cost of the A75 / A76 mitigation. The TA does not discuss commuted sums nor does it explore what such sums could be spent on. Any commuted sum taken in this respect should be spent timeously.

(i) The TA examines the key town centre junctions in similar detail and concludes there are no mitigations required. It does begin to consider “blue light” routes and reliability of journey times at the Pleasance Ave / New Abbey Road junction. However, the TA does not discuss this aspect (blue light routes) or road safety in any further detail.

(j) The modelling of town centre junctions was based on the Dumfries Traffic Model flows and has lead to assumptions about the level of performance of the traffic signal controlled river crossings which present a more favourable picture than is the case. The statistic “percentage reserve capacity” (PRC) at these signal junctions is reported in the TA but is overly optimistic at each location. These junctions are known to be at capacity but the TA states the PRC can range from 20% to 35% at Buccleuch St Bridge and 40% to 45% at St Michael’s Bridge. The PRC in its absolute value is less important here than its relative value. In this case, it suggests that the reality of traffic assignments is that they will favour St Michael’s Bridge rather than Buccleuch St Bridge.

(k) Taking all this together, the TA is more than likely underestimating the impact on Pleasance Avenue and the route to the Garroch site leading from St Michael’s Bridge. This is reflected in the varying percentage changes identified in the sector analysis from matrix estimation and the GEH statistic (DMRB).

(l) Notwithstanding the above characteristics of the model building and assignments, at a basic level, Pleasance Avenue shows a straightforward increase in traffic volumes of around 11% when the observed traffic flows are compared to the traffic generated by the hospital at Garroch.

(m) Parking provision at the Garroch site is discussed in detail and the conclusions are robust, having been based upon detailed knowledge of parking taken from very recent surveys at the existing Bankend Rd site. The management of parking both at the new location and the residual site will be extremely important to the effective delivery of sustainable transport objectives - 980 spaces are proposed. Discussions regarding the precise provision, its layout and management can be progressed apart from the TA process and included in the Travel Plan development.

(n) A travel plan is required and the TA identifies this although repeats, in the main, the existing plan for the Bankend Rd site. A Travel Plan should be prepared with clear objectives and targets. It should include a parking management strategy to maintain a balance between provision and constraint as the facility develops. The plan should include a dedicated travel plan co-ordinator (including parking management) to deliver the sustainable objectives of mitigation measures. The Travel Plan should clearly set out these objectives, quantify them, how they will be measured and how their achievement will be identified such that, in time, any bond can be discharged. The Travel Plan can be a condition on the planning permission; it does not need to be submitted as part of the application. These objectives could be secured by a bond arrangement.
Mitigations on Council Road Network

(a) The Council has identified three junctions which it considers would be adversely affected in terms of road safety and possibly traffic flows, given the comments above regarding the modelling work and known levels of operation:

- Pleasance Ave / New Abbey Rd.
- New Abbey Rd / Park Rd.
- Park Rd / Dalbeattie Rd.

(b) Despite this, the TA does not identify any mitigation measures within the town centre. However, the applicant proposes a cost sharing agreement for the provision of local road mitigations identified by the Council.

(c) The improvements to the junctions identified above are required through reduced queuing and delays to ensure:

- Emergency vehicle access (“blue light” routes) are protected and improved, particularly in terms of queuing vehicles.
- Access to and from the hospital to the Crichton is improved particularly for emergency vehicles in the light of expanding facilities at that location.
- The impact of parked vehicles is minimised especially on Pleasance Ave.
- The new facility is easily accessible, particularly from the south-east of Dumfries, meaning not just accessible within the current conditions but improved conditions.
- Links between the residual facility and the new hospital are unimpeded.
- The road safety at these locations would be generally improved including reduced “rat running” through the adjacent housing estates.
- Improved network operation supports bus services and makes them more reliable and efficient, encouraging more sustainable transport.
- The modelling work and the comments above leave sufficient doubt that the predicted traffic flows may not materialise at the levels suggested and, as is likely, may in fact be higher.

(d) These three junctions have been the subject of a stage 1 road safety audit (RSA). The audit identifies that the junction improvements can successfully be implemented from a road safety point of view but does not comment of the safety aspects of the existing junctions. It also examined cycling access and made recommendations regarding this. It is appropriate that these detailed discussions continue apart from the TA process. Nevertheless, preliminary layout designs have been prepared for all three and a capacity evaluation has been undertaken for two of these junctions, namely, Pleasance Ave / New Abbey Rd and Park Rd / Dalbeattie Rd.

(e) The implementation of the proposed mitigation at Park Road / New Abbey Road is not straightforward and limited in scope. Ideally, adjacent land is required but it is in third party ownership. This land is not identified for housing in current or proposed development plans and so any opportunity which could be afforded by such development to realign Park Road at this location is likely to be some considerable time away. Nevertheless, whilst there is merit in progressing this improvement in the same timescale as the hospital relocation, there are pragmatic reasons for continuing consideration of this particular junction. Overall, it would be prudent to await consideration of the Local Development Plan and subsequent land allocations which may afford the opportunity for meaningful and effective improvement. Should the provision of this mitigation be continued for further consideration, it is important, nevertheless, that the Council continues to acknowledge its need to ensure any future developments in the vicinity can legitimately be expected to contribute to its provision.
(f) It is important to determine if the proposed designs provide sufficient capacity for predicted traffic levels (design reference flows) in the “design year” – 10 to 15 years after opening. The capacity assessment of the proposed designs for the A710 New Abbey Rd / A756 Pleasance Avenue junction and Park Road / Dalbeattie Road junction indicates sufficient capacity. The applicant has separately agreed with officers that only these two junctions need form part of the proposed mitigation measures on local roads.

(g) It is essential that the applicant demonstrates the local road mitigations can be delivered and are fit for purpose prior to planning permission being granted and any legal agreement being entered into for their provision.

(h) Separate from the TA, a discussion has taken place regarding the junction of the realigned Glen Road with the hospital access road. A second RSA has been undertaken on the proposed A75 / Garroch Loaning junction (site access) and includes this second junction (which would be on an adopted Council road). Again, it is appropriate that these detailed discussions continue apart from the TA process. The service access and emergency access (EVA) separate from A and E, is also the subject of discussions.

Conclusion
(a) The Transport Assessment (TA) process has identified the main issues and the applicant has agreed with Transport Scotland an acceptable model for delivery of proposed Trunk road mitigation measures which includes the potential for commuted sums to be paid by the applicant.
(b) The applicant proposes a cost sharing model for the agreed Local road mitigation measures, which is acceptable.
(c) The TA identifies appropriate sustainable transport mitigation measures in terms of walking and cycling.
(d) The applicant, in conjunction with SWestrans, proposes acceptable arrangements to be put in place to ensure appropriate opportunities to travel to the site by public transport.
(e) The TA proposes an acceptable level of parking provision and a strategy to manage its provision.
(f) The TA proposes an acceptable Travel Plan and method of delivering it including the parking strategy identified above.

2.4 Council Roads Officer: No objections, subject to conditions.

(a) Roads: A75 Trunk Road, U225n Garroch Loaning, U347n The Old Glen, U350n Garroch Industrial Estate Road.

(b) This site is located remote from Dumfries adjacent to Garroch Business Park. The supplied plans show that a new access road is proposed to the site off the A75 Trunk Road at the Garroch roundabout. It also shows the U347n Old Glen public road being realigned to link onto the proposed new access road and an emergency service (Blue Light) access point being taken off it adjacent to a proposed helipad. Appropriate visibility of 2 x 215m is available to the west but visibility to the east is restricted to 2 x 65m. Furthermore, the proposed access location is almost opposite the access to Kilnford Barns. Whilst it is acknowledged that the applicant has control over the necessary ground to achieve appropriate visibility, it would be appropriate that the applicant reconsider the location for this access further along the site frontage to the east where verge widths are in excess of 4m and there is suitable junction separation. A further link to the adopted road network (rear service access) is indicated off the U350n Garroch Industrial Estate Road. The detail of the proposed links to the U347n and U350n public roads should be submitted.
and agreed in writing by the planning authority in consultation with the roads authority.

(c) The proximity of the proposed helipad to the public road gives concern regarding (a) distraction to motorists to the detriment of road safety and (b) the attraction it may create that would encourage informal parking on the U347n public road for observance purposes. It would be appropriate that any future application be accompanied by proposals to screen or mitigate the impact of its location.

(d) It should be noted that this proposal will require:

- a Stopping-up Order to have been successfully promoted and implemented in respect of any portions of the U347n public road that will lie outwith a revised road boundary;
- that the new primary access road, from the A75 Trunk Road to a point (to be finalised) south-west of the proposed new Old Glen junction, will be subject to Road Construction Consent (RCC) and must include a scheme of streetlighting;
- that depending on the nature and extent of the link to the U350n public road RCC may be required;
- that where private access points are to be formed onto a public road and where Utility service connections have to be made in public roads, Road Opening Permits will require to be issued by the roads authority; &
- that Road Infrastructure Improvements identified on plan AA3322/P/02 dated 17.01.13 be finalised. No detailed plans for these accompany this application. The details of these are currently being discussed with the Council in respect of the Local Road Network.

(e) No internal roads, cyclepaths or parking areas will be adopted by the Council and these will therefore remain the responsibility of the NHS D&G estate.

(f) Whilst there are no objections in principle to the proposed internal road layout, no detailed internal roads or parking plans for the proposed hospital site are included in this submission and therefore no consent should be issued in respect of the same. Any future application should accompany internal road layouts with swept path tracks demonstrating that the different types of vehicles accessing all the different areas of this site can park and manoeuvre appropriately. (This should include ambulances, buses and all types of delivery / supply / servicing vehicles).

(g) It should be noted that:

- a response from the Council Road Strategy and Transportation Officer has been provided separately;
- off-site road, cycleway and sustainable transport improvements, are to be the subject of a Section 69 Agreement between the applicant and the Council; &
- 980 car parking spaces are identified in the submission (911 general use and 69 disabled use) and 80 Cycle parking spaces. It is understood that the TA and Travel Plan support the level of parking provision being proposed.

(h) The supplied plan "Site Diagrams" (KEP-G (90)X-XX-04 includes a Site Expansion Diagram that considers potential expansion of the facility. It should be noted that item 3, the major department extension negatively affects the proposed parking provision and in itself will have an associated level of parking requirement that will raise the overall provision required for the site. Whilst this may be purely indicative at this stage, it would be appropriate that the plan identify where the additional parking requirement could be provided within the site.

(i) Whilst no details are provided at this stage of road layout and drainage, it should be noted that any SUDS taking surface water from any adoptable road will require that the landowner / developer will need to enter into a legal agreement which will form a part of
the SUDS Maintenance Agreement. This will place responsibility for the construction and maintenance of the SUDS system with the owners and then in the event of the road being adopted, the owners grant the Council as roads authority the right to discharge roads surface water into the SUDS system. Construction Consent will only be granted on the recording of the legal agreement. It is suggested that a copy of the Maintenance Agreement is made available to Dumfries and Galloway Council - Legal Services for approval at an early stage.

(i) It should be noted that in addition to directional road signage that will be required by the proposed hospital and will require to have been installed prior to the hospital opening or coming into use, all road signage relating to the existing hospital location on Bankend Road will require to have been rationalised and removed or updated, all at the applicant’s expense.

(j) The representations made by Troqueer Landward Community Council are noted, as follows:-

- Increased trip generation on U221n Carruchan Beeches and U220n Moss Road. It would be appropriate that the NHS consultants estimate the trip generation from the A710 at Islesteps and beyond to quantify this assertion.
- The Old Glen proposed junction arrangement, and equal consideration to other users of the Old Glen road. The Old Glen public road is to be used as a “Blue Light Access” and in considering the various junction options, the applicant advised that the use of yellow box junction, on the ghost island option, will ensure that a clear path is maintained for ambulances turning right on the Old Glen Road. It was considered that a roundabout would provide less control over a clear access route due to vehicles sitting on the roundabout lanes at peak times. The benefits of this arrangement to emergency vehicles will apply equally to other users of the Old Glen public road.
- Spill over parking onto the Old Glen public road. Parking can and should be subject to monitoring once the hospital is in operation. The Travel Plan to be submitted by the applicant will contain a parking strategy to ensure that the parking supply fits appropriately with demand.

2.5 Council Sustainable Travel Officer:- No objections.

2.6 Dumfries and Galloway Constabulary:- No objections.

(a) Access to the new hospital would be from the A75 / Garroch Loaning roundabout but it is acknowledged that secondary / emergency access routes will be provided in the event that an incident / accident occurs on this actual roundabout thus preventing normal access to the hospital. Access via Garroch Farm and / or Garroch Business Park would allow a secondary access, via the A711 and U225 if the need arises.

(b) 980 car parking spaces are proposed. The off road car parking provision must accommodate the number of vehicles requiring to park at the site. What cannot be permitted is the overflow of parked vehicles onto the surrounding road network as happens at the existing hospital site. It may be advisable to have electronic signs at the entrance to each car park in order visitors know in advance where to find an available car parking space instead of driving around the ground looking for one.

(c) The documents submitted with the application highlights the desire for a parking strategy and the fact that the surrounding road network provides an unrestricted parking supply. Depending on what is proposed within the site, motorists may be tempted to park
out on the public road network to the detriment of other vehicle movements. The strategy will include different durations of stay in the car park and that parking enforcement is stated as a key aspect. Although the enforcement agency is still to be determined at this early stage, it is highlighted that Police Officers / Traffic Wardens will not be directed to enforce restrictions imposed within this car park.

(d) Presumably the bus services would travel through the hospital ground and therefore provision for same must be taken into account.

(e) It would be ideal if the helipad was out of view from passing road users on the adjacent A75 and U225 roadways in order that a distraction is not caused resulting in a road safety issue.

(f) There will obviously be an increase in vehicle numbers attracted to this area of town, it is trusted that all junctions can accommodate the expected increase in vehicle numbers.

(g) A meeting has already taken place between the applicant and a Crime Reduction Officer in order to discuss security issues.

2.7 **Council Landscape Architect**: No objections, subject to conditions.

**Background**

(a) It is noted that this is an application for planning in principal and therefore full details of the proposed development are not available. Building heights, mass and even location of key elements within the site were not known at the time the LVIA was completed, so predicted potential impacts on landscape and visual amenity are not entirely clear at this stage. Paragraph 9.2 of the ES states that this information will be fully assessed following detailed design and the LVIA reviewed in advanced of the detailed planning stage.

(b) The key aspect at this stage should be to develop design principles which are used to inform the detailed design process – and that these principles take account of both positive and detrimental landscape and visual impacts.

(c) Policy E1 in the Structure Plan relates to National Scenic Areas (NSAs). The site is within 3.3km of the Nith Estuary NSA. However, proposals are unlikely to have any impact on the NSA because it is screened by landform so this policy has not been considered. It is within 200m of the Terregles Ridge Regional Scenic Area (RSA) and 1.6km of the Solway Coast RSA so Policy E2 has been considered. The requirement to consider landscape character, as set out in the Dumfries and Galloway Landscape Assessment (DGLA), is covered by Structure Plan policy E3. Policy E11 in the Structure Plan relates to historic gardens and designed landscapes. There are a number of Non-inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes within 5km of the site and (see below).

**Site and Context**

(a) The site lies at the western edge of the Nith valley where the landform starts to rise into the distinctive and prominent Terregles Ridge. The ridge and the corresponding Torthorwald Ridge to the east of Dumfries enclose and overlook the valley. The valley is characterised by an open landscape with long views and a mix of prime agricultural land and settlements ranging from isolated farms to the principal settlement of Dumfries.

(b) The site is outwith but adjacent to the Dumfries settlement boundary, ‘nestled’ against the rising land of the ridgeline. To the south-east and east of the site lies a single dwelling (Garroch Farm) and Garroch Industrial Estate which includes a chemical works with a tall tower (approximately 22-28m) which creates a prominent feature within the local landscape. Further to the south are an area of housing (Cargenbridge) and the open agricultural landscapes of Carruchan and the lower Nith valley.
(c) A national cycle route passes near to the site, providing direct access to Dumfries town centre and to the wider countryside.

(d) West of the site is the Non-inventory Designed Landscape of Terraughtie House, a small policy wood (High Wood) and the ridgeline of the Terregles Ridge RSA. The A75 trunk road passes to the north of the site leading from a roundabout which provides access to Dumfries from the west and links to the A711 for Dalbeattie and the East Stewartry Coast NSA and tourism area. Kilnford farm shop and plant nursery lies between the A75 and the site boundary. It is accessed of a minor road which passes under the A75 leading to Millhill and Terregles village.

(e) The landscape around Dumfries is relatively flat and open with long views across the valley; especially from the A75. With the exception of the industrial estate, it has a dispersed and fine grain of settlement, characterised by individual farmsteads or clusters of smaller scale development. The creation of a large structure would be a prominent landscape feature and might appear out of scale and character with the surrounding agricultural landscape. A key principle of development should be to limit potential detrimental impacts from the development on long views by careful building alignment, use of appropriate colours, materials and screening.

Development Proposal

(a) Details of the proposed development are not fixed at this stage; however, the ES states that; ‘The proposed construction method will involve a significant reconfiguration of the existing ground levels to achieve the finished floor level and will require extensive earth work i.e. cut and fill to be carried out... There will be a large quantity of excess topsoil arising from the site works and it is planned that this material will be retained and used on site for landscaping and screening purposes’.

(b) The LVIA assumes that there will be a three storey main building with extensive earthworks used to set the lower floor into the landform, also that there will be outlying buildings (including the energy centre and accommodation buildings), with associated upgrading of the existing road network, on-site road development and associated underground service connections’. Visualisations also include car parking, a helipad and extensive landscape bunding and planting.

(c) The A75 roundabout would be adapted to provide the principal access point to the hospital with emergency access via the minor road near Kilnford and service access via the industrial estate. Additional off-site infrastructure works would be necessary.

(d) The ES indicates that the preferred materials pallet for the external façade of the buildings comprises predominately natural materials with powder coated aluminium framed window and curtain wall systems. Materials under consideration include natural stone, clay facing brickwork and concealed fix rain screen (terracotta tile, synthetic stone, solid laminate, ceramic tile.). The ES states that, ‘Render systems should be limited due to their weathering characteristics with timber cladding not being favoured due the potential fire spread risk however, metal cladding may be considered for plant rooms’ and ‘All external walls are to comply with Building Standards Regulations SHTM81 and be certified and tested 60/60 fire resistance from inside and outside. This requirement will only be relaxed with the Board’s agreement to a Fire Engineers risk assessment’.

Landscape Features

(a) The site is characterised by agricultural land and includes five small to medium scale
fields, used for grazing and enclosed by thorn hedges (two are separated by a post and wire fence). The site includes a domed post glacial moraine feature with an increase of 10-12m between the site boundaries and the high point which is between the centre of the site and the front / northern boundary. There are no burns within the site but a drainage ditch runs along the western boundary, feeding into the Cargen Water to the north.

(b) There are a number of hedgerow trees within the southern boundary and within a hedge that crosses the site from north to south. Unfortunately, the Tree Survey in the ES does not include a numbered plan showing specific trees, though the consultant has surveyed individual trees and made recommendations for their retention, enhancement or removal. It appears that the author of the Tree Survey was unaware of proposals to make significant alterations to ground levels in the proposed works, since recommendations to retain many of the trees are unrealistic if ground levels around the main buildings are to be radically altered.

(c) It would appear that six of the ten individual trees surveyed and one of the three tree groups would have to be felled to accommodate proposed level changes. Two other trees on the western boundary would probably have to be felled to accommodate the proposed helipad. Two groups of trees on the western and southern boundaries would be retained as a feature but would require remedial and formative pruning works to ensure their longevity.

(d) The remaining two individual trees are very prominent oaks toward the northern end of the hedgerow which passes through the centre of the site. These are assessed in the survey as grade A1 or A2 (trees numbered 379 and 380); indicating that they are worthy of retention; it is also considered that retaining these two trees as an element of the historic existing landscape could enhance the setting of the proposed development. They fall into an area identified for car parking so could potentially be affected by level changes or other engineering works. However, given their prominence in the local landscape and the potential loss of all other individual trees within the site, it is recommended that these trees be retained as landscape features. It should be possible to design landform / levels, parking and access around these features.

Landscape Character
(a) The site lies within the Lower Nithsdale unit of the Lower Dale Landscape Character Type (LCT) and is close to the boundary with the Terregles unit of the Upland Fringe LCT. The DGLA recognises the open nature of the lower dale landscape, suggesting that ‘planting screens would be the most effective and sympathetic way of integrating new developments in this flat landscape’. It also notes the importance of gateway ‘impressions’ of the valley and suggests the overall strategy should be to enhance this landscape.

(b) For the upland fringe landscapes the DGLA suggests; ‘buildings should avoid breaking the skyline and should not be permitted on exposed open sites’ and adds that; ‘...any proposals should demonstrate careful siting and design that can contribute to and reinforce the local character rather than detract from it’. It also states that given the potential high visibility of sites within this LCT; ‘careful siting of new development is required; the use of local materials and colours in new building projects should be encouraged’.

(d) The proposed hospital would be visible intermittently over a wide area, so the design and appearance within the local context will be important. The use of tree planting and earth bunding as screening are welcomed and would be consistent with the local landscape character, provided bunds are organic and natural in appearance to replicate
fluvio-glacial features found in the local area. Proposed buildings are unlikely to break the skyline from most viewpoints, with the exception of localised views, especially if the main buildings are set into the slope.

(e) Given the scale and nature of the proposed development, it may be more appropriate to use contemporary design and materials (provided they respond to and respect the local landscape and built character), rather than attempting to replicate the local vernacular by using materials and colours more akin with traditional housing (noting also the design principles set out below).

**Visual Impact**

(a) The LVIA is based on assumptions about the eventual appearance of the proposed development. It is concerning that the methodology used in the LVIA does not lead to an accurate picture of potential impacts from the development. For example, the ‘sensitivity’ of visual receptors should be based on sensitivity to a potential change. This can then be combined with an assessment of the magnitude of potential change as a result of the proposed development, to predict the likely significance of visual impacts. According to the GLVIA, visual sensitivity will depend on the location and context of the viewpoint, the expectations and occupation or activity of the receptor and the importance of the view. However, the LVIA includes predicted changes to views within their assessment of sensitivity and in the magnitude of proposed change, effectively counting it twice. As a result, residential dwellings within 2km of the site are given a low sensitivity rating and the significance of potential change is ‘artificially’ low.

(b) The LVIA also considers potential beneficial effects from key mitigation measures in assessments of visual impact rather than predicting impacts purely against the landscape baseline. This does not follow guidelines in the GLVIA and leads to confusion because any benefits from screening as a result of potential mitigation and as a result of the existing landscape baseline are not clearly separated. Mitigation measures are usually identified as an outcome of the LVIA process to mitigate potential effects and Section 9.10 of the LVIA does list potential measures.

(c) The LVIA suggests that potential visual impacts from the proposed development would be reduced by on-site landscape screening. As this is a planning in principle application, details of potential screening are implied rather than fixed. It is recommended that the principle of using tree planting to soften the visual impact of the development is a condition of any planning permission.

(d) The LVIA states that the building will be ‘...carefully orientated to minimise its visual impact’. The illustrative photomontages suggest a very prominent contemporary style of building which is entirely consistent with a modern hospital and should create an interesting new focal feature within the landscape. However, the mass and scale of building could also detract from the more rural aspects and views across the Nith valley. The existing industrial estate presents a different context to these views and the scale and mass of built forms within the estate appear out of context with the rural setting. It is not recommended that these should be used as a ‘benchmark’ for design of the hospital site or buildings, and hence proposals to ‘sink’ the building into the landscape should be a principle of development.

(e) Proposals to use excess materials to form earth bunds around the site are welcomed, provided that these elements contribute to the landscape and visual appearance and are based on an appreciation of local landscape character. Details of the alignment, scale and form of these earthworks should be part of any full planning application.
(f) The ZTV indicates that the proposed development would theoretically be visible from parts of the valley bottom to the north, west and south of Dumfries but is restricted by landform from most other locations (noting that it is restricted to the 5km study area and doesn’t pick up for example, potential visibility form across the Nith valley). Theoretical visibility within Dumfries is restricted to the western edge of the settlement but in reality would be further screened from most viewpoints by trees and woodland, built forms and local smaller-scale landforms not picked up by a ZTV. Whilst the ZTV is restricted to a 5km radius from the development site, patterns of visibility suggest that it will be visible from further afield to the east and north-east. Theoretical visibility from south of the site will be constrained by the nearby planting and industrial estate, so whilst the ZTV suggests the proposal would be seen from Dock Park and the Crichton area, actual views are likely to be obscured or limited to upper sections of the built form. It is considered that these would not experience a significant visual impact. Visibility to the south of the A711 Dalbeattie road is likely to be completely obscured by trees, woodland and the industrial estate. The ZTV is consistent with descriptions of potential visibility in the LVIA. It does indicate that the development is likely to be visible in longer views from the north-east and east and it is suggested, again, that establishing the principle of using muted colours, non-reflective surfaces, etc to reduce potential visual impacts on these longer views should be a key requirement of the detailed design.

Impacts on Nearby Dwellings and other Receptors
(a) Designed Landscapes. It is considered that potential effects on Terraughtie Non-inventory Designed Landscape would be high rather than ‘moderate-adverse’. The designed landscape and house is adjacent to and with principal elevated views over the site; it is a residential dwelling and therefore visual sensitivity should be assessed as high. The magnitude of change will be high during construction and medium to high post-construction; though this may reduce as tree screening matures. The LVIA suggests that the proposed development would improve on existing views from Terraughtie. However, proposals would bring development much closer to the viewer and would present a substantial change to the existing vista across open fields and beyond the tower. Undertaking a significant element of landscaping and tree planting prior to starting the main works could be used to mitigate these aspects. The proposed development is unlikely to have any significant impacts on the other Non-inventory Designed Landscapes in the area because they are either too far away or are screened by landform. This is supported in the LVIA.
(b) Dwellings within 2km of the Site. Terraughtie House and Cottages, Garroch Farm, Garroch View and Garroch Cottages are close to the proposed site. Terraughtie House and Garroch Farm are likely to experience substantial changes to visual amenity, though in both cases the use of bunding and planting could help mitigate detrimental effects. Garroch View is likely to experience significant changes to views from upper floor bedrooms but would be otherwise screened by existing planting. This effect could be mitigated in part by proposed planting and bunding toward the front of the site. Terraughtie Cottages and Garroch Cottages are likely to be screened by intervening landform and existing planting.
(c) The site is within 2km of a number of other small settlements and isolated dwellings plus the outskirts of Dumfries. Visibility is likely to be screened from many locations by intervening landform, tree cover, etc. However, the following locations may experience some intervisibility; Kirkland, Barnhill, Terregles Ridge, Terreglestown, Kilnford. It is not
expected these to be significant detrimental impacts because, (i) they are likely to be partial views experienced at a distance of several hundred metres, (ii) the potential change in view will be a minor element of the view, (iii) the proposed development is likely to be softened by tree planting and set against the backdrop of the Terregles ridge. The following settlements and dwellings are unlikely to experience any visual effects from the proposed development; Clunie, Staryheugh Farm, Summerhill, Curriestanes, Cargenbridge, Priestlands, Drumsleet, Carruchan, Westhill, South Castlehill and Waterside.

(d) Nearby Roads and Paths. The LVIA sets visual sensitivity for all road users as ‘low’ whereas the GLVIA suggests it is likely to be higher, depending on the context and scale of potential change. The Landscape Architect agrees with the LVIA however, that potential impacts on nearby roads, including the A75, will be intermittent and partially screened by intervening existing vegetation. The N7 cycle route is also unlikely to experience significant detrimental visual impacts from the development due to partial screening from intervening tree cover and buildings. Proposed planting will also help screen the development once established. A Core Path (‘Terraughtie Path’; TROQ 132/1) passes close to the sites western boundary, linking to an access track south of the industrial estate. Users of this path would experience significant changes to views from short sections of the path and potentially detrimental effects from the construction phase of operations.

Recommendations
(a) Despite reservations over the methodology and validity of the findings of the LVIA, it is considered that potentially significant detrimental landscape and visual impacts are likely to be restricted to two nearby dwellings and intermittent partial views from nearby roads, paths and cycle routes. Subject to the adoption of suitable design principles as set out below, there are no landscape or visual reasons why the in principle application should not be supported.

(b) Principles of development. Whether the visual appearance of the development is perceived as a positive or detrimental contribution to existing views (including from the nearest dwellings) will depend on a number of factors which have not as yet been established. Whilst the visualisations that accompany the planning application give an illustration of what the proposed development may look like, it is recommended that the following design principles for the appearance of the development are clearly defined and agreed as part of any in principle planning permission:

- The proposed development should not conflict or compete with the settlement hierarchy and central buildings of Dumfries
- Potential detrimental impacts on long views should be limited by careful building alignment, use of appropriate non-reflective and muted colours, materials and screening.
- Tree planting should be used to soften the visual impact of the development and enhance the local environment including car parking areas and access routes.
- Set the main building into the landscape by reducing ground levels to reduce overall height of visible structures.
- The alignment, scale and form of potential earthworks should reflect local landscape character and landforms as well as providing an element of screening.
- Retain the two trees located toward the front (northern) end of the site as landscape features, designing landform / levels, parking and access around the trees.
- Retain or reinstate existing hedgerows and trees on the site boundary.
- Encourage access to the wider environment for patients, staff and visitors.
- Use a suitable contemporary design and materials (provided they respond to and respect the local landscape and built character).
- Enhance existing views by screening views of the Garroch industrial estate through tree planting and landform changes.

2.8 **Historic Scotland**: No objections. Historic Scotland are content that the proposed development will not result in any significant adverse effects on the site or setting of assets within our statutory remit.

2.9 **Council Archaeologist**: No objections, subject to condition.

**Archaeology**
(a) A desk based assessment is provided, which draws on records, historic mapping and previous fieldwork in the vicinity, concludes: ‘There are no previously recorded cultural heritage assets within the application area. In considering the archaeological record for the surrounding area and previous archaeological fieldwork along the route of the A75, it is concluded that there is low potential for previously unrecorded cultural heritage assets in the application area’. This assessment is concurred with and it is advised that there are no archaeological grounds for recommending refusal of this application for planning permission in principle. To allow for the possibility, assessed as low, that features of interest might come to light as a result of ground disturbance, a directive is recommended.

**Cultural Heritage**
(b) Terraughtie House, listed Category B, is surrounded by a non-inventory designed landscape that extends to the western edge of the proposal area. There is no assessment of the indirect effects of the proposal on these assets in the documents submitted. The principle elevation of the house faces south. Examination of aerial photographs suggests that the eastern elevation of the house, which faces the proposal, is screened by a line of planting to define a garden around the house. Also the ground falls to the east. That said, the amenity and setting of the House may be affected by strong, 24 hour lighting introduced at the hospital. Planting on western edge of the proposal site could reduce any such effects.

2.10 **SNH**: No objections.
(a) SNH note the results of all protected species surveys undertaken to date and agree with the recommendations for further work. Mitigation suggested is all acceptable.
(b) SNH would of course like the opportunity to comment the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and Construction Method Statement (CMS) when available.
(c) In terms of Landscape and Visual Impact, it is noted that the ES is for planning permission in principle and the final design has not been developed. SNH do not consider this proposal will affect any landscape designations of national importance.

2.11 **Council Biodiversity Officer**: No objections.
The proposal to develop a site wide conservation management plan, linked to the Dumfries and Galloway Local Biodiversity Action Plan, is welcomed.

2.12 **SEPA**: No objections, subject to conditions.
Flood Risk
(a) The FRA has identified a baseline condition with 2 watercourses flowing throw or in proximity to the proposed development. Review of the Indicative River and Coastal Flood Map (Scotland) indicates that the development is outwith the 200 year flood outline of watercourses over the 3km² catchment area threshold. It has also been confirmed that the development area does not currently have a record of historical flooding.
(b) In terms of flood management, the 1000 year standard of protection should be adopted for the hospital with an appropriate minimum finished floor level (FFL) used and an appropriate planning drawing should be provided at the full planning stage confirming that this has been undertaken. The FRA makes a number of flood management recommendations in relations to SUDS, finished ground levels and access / egress.
(c) In terms of the hydraulic assessment, given the watercourse characteristics, it is accepted that basic Manning’s calculations are acceptable in this instance and it is acknowledged that additional cross-sections have been assessed based on survey data. Photographic evidence of the watercourse has also been provided to verify the roughness values proposed which are thought to be acceptable. It is also noted that an assessment of the two culverts present within the area has also been undertaken and verified. Based on the information provided, SEPA are satisfied that the proposed development is outwith the floodplain of the minor watercourse (Terraughtie Burn) and therefore compliant with the principles of Scottish Planning Policy (SPP).
(d) The potential pluvial flood risk has also been considered with flow pathways identified based on topography and recommendation of a number of management measures to reduce the risk to the hospital and surrounding land. It is stated that SUDS is outwith the scope of this FRA but it is acknowledged that this has been considered a key design element. As such, it is also recommended that planning permission is conditional on the adoption of appropriate surface water management measures which would incorporate SUDS.
(e) SEPA previously stated that the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) should also encompass the Cargen Water specifically in relation access/egress rather than a specific risk to the hospital itself. Further information in relation to emergency planning routes has addressed those original concerns to SEPAs satisfaction.
(f) SEPA also previously required confirmation of design flow calculations for the hydrological modelling that had been undertaken, and this has now been answered to SEPA’s satisfaction.

Air Quality
(a) The current assessment uses a simple screening tool (DMRB) and concludes that there will be negligible impact on air quality. However, the report has not considered the cumulative impact of the development. The proposal will incorporate a biomass boiler, is close to the Garroch roundabout / A75 carriageway and to the DuPont Teijan Films UK site to the south-west.
(b) SEPA is of the opinion that the proposal has the potential to result in significant changes in emissions and therefore, air quality may need to be assessed using a more robust model such as ADMS Roads or equivalent.
(c) The report also uses Air Quality Archive maps taken from the Scottish Government’s website for use as pollutant background concentrations: this data is speculative and should only be used where no monitoring is available. SEPA would therefore recommend that the local authority, in their capacity as the appropriate authority on local air quality
management, request the developer undertakes background monitoring at the most representative receptor and undertakes a further assessment of local air quality, coordinated with the objectives outlined in Environmental Protection UK Guidance: Development Control: Planning for Air Quality.

**Foul Drainage**
(a) Scottish Water’s assessment of the site must demonstrate that the existing sewerage system can accommodate the development’s flow with no detriment to the current situation. If this is not the case, a Development Impact Assessment (DIA) should be carried out to identify mitigation measures that provide either betterment or no detriment to the existing system to Scottish Water’s satisfaction.
(b) SEPA are of the view that drainage is a material planning consideration and further, that potential impacts on the water environment must also be considered in the determination of planning applications. It is proposed that foul drainage would discharge to the public sewer but there may be issues with capacity at the pumping stations at Garroch and Cargenbridge. Consultation with Scottish Water will be required who may have to discuss with SEPA if there is any requirement for a variation of their sewer network licence.

**Surface Water Drainage**
(a) The proposed discharge of surface water to the water environment must be in accordance with the principles of the SUDS Manual (C697) which was published by CIRIA in March 2007. The discharge of surface water must comply with the terms of the Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011. However, the design of the drainage system must be site specific and dependent upon the contaminants at the site, the remediation strategy and the risks posed by any residual contamination, in addition to the normal design considerations.
(b) It is proposed that SUDS for the site will drain to the Terrauthtie Burn a tributary of the Cargen Water and the discharge should be no greater than the Greenfield run-off rate. The requirement for any additional attenuation storage for alleviating any flood issues should be discussed with the local authority.
(c) Due to the size of this development, a licence under The Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 will be required for the SUDS.

**Drinking water supply**
(a) It is understood that there had been previous discussions about a water supply borehole for this site but that this is no longer being considered.

**Waste**
(a) Scottish Planning Policy Paragraph 215 states that “residential, commercial and industrial properties should be designed to provide for waste separation and collection.” In accordance with this policy and PAN 63 Waste Management Planning, space should be designated within the planning application site layout to allow for the separation and collection of waste, consistent with the type of development proposed.

**Contaminated Land**
(a) The local authority is the lead authority in relation to contaminated land and SEPA therefore request that the Council’s Environmental Services Department be consulted and
those responsible for implementing the contaminated land regime regarding this proposal. These contaminated land specialists will take a lead on commenting on the planning application, with SEPA’s contaminated land specialists providing input directly to them in relation to impacts upon the water environment.

2.13 Council Flood Management Team: No objections, subject to conditions.
(a) The area proposed for development lies outwith the 1 in 1000 year (0.1% probability) fluvial floodplain. However, access and egress to site maybe cut off as both the A75 and A711 at Cargen Bridge are within the floodplain.
(b) Site ground levels vary within the site from 13.5m to 23.8m AOD, FFL is 20.5m with a basement level of 17.5m AOD,
(c) Desk-based study has been carried out to establish baseline FRA; this needs updated with topographical survey data.
(d) Mitigation measures for pluvial flooding are required and developer will consider these in detail during the detailed design stage,
(e) Developer will control run-off from construction through implementing measures in the site Construction Environmental Management Plan,
(f) 1 in 200 Year flood envelope from the Terraughtie Burn has a flood level of 14.07m AOD and is shown on drawing 163529J-001. Drawing also highlights a small section of the indicative internal access road is within the 1 in 200 Year flood envelope.
(g) A detailed FRA should be submitted at time of Full Planning Application, with the FRA to include the 1 in 1000 year flood event level and FFL. It is noted that the NHS will be undertaking a 1:1,000 year fluvial flood risk assessment on the Terraughtie Burn to inform any amendments required to the adjacent internal access road in relation to flood levels.
(h) Access and egress to the site on both the A75 and A711 at Cargen Bridge are within the 1 in 1000 year fluvial floodplain. Further detail on flood levels at these locations will be required to determine whether emergency vehicles can gain access to the hospital. Given the requirements of SPP on accessibility, it is reasonable to expect that the level of access possible under flood conditions be assessed noting that the debate arises over the extent of access that should be provided under extreme flood conditions. This risk should be quantified and it is noted that NHS D&G accept that they should progress this FRA to inform any reasonable mitigation, or acceptance of risk, in accessing the proposed site under a 1:1,000 year fluvial flood event on the Cargen Water. It is noted that the planning authority do not believe that it would be competent to condition off-site works to maintain access to the A75 under the extreme flood events being considered and agree that it would be inappropriate to seek a requirement for such off-site works given the options for accessing the site and debate over the extent of access that should be provided. However, it would be appropriate for the NHS to identify the level of disruption to access associated with a 1:1,000 year fluvial flood event on the Cargen Water and the options open to them to manage or accept the risk. This should inform their contingency planning to respond to flood events e.g. alternative road access routes and helicopter access.
(i) From a brief site inspection of the alternative access routes proposed by the NHS’s Consultant, there would seem to be viable, but narrow in places, alternative road access. Under the rainfall events that would lead to significant fluvial flooding risk, it is possible that pluvial flooding of fields would affect the alternative road accesses being considered. Consideration would need to be given to managing these alternative access routes, to permit local and hospital access and not for diversion of the A75 traffic, if the A75 was impassable. It is noted that the NHS / SAS will assess the viability of these alternative
access routes as blue light routes in relation to ambulance journey times. It would seem that the use of the Maxwelltown Cycle route is not feasible as an alternative blue light access route without significant works to the Cargenbridge end of the cycleway to accommodate vehicle movements over the height difference between the cycleway and the public road.

2.14 **Scottish Water**: No objections.
(a) Initial investigations have highlighted there may be a requirement for the developer to carry out works on the local wastewater network to ensure there is no loss of service to existing customers. The Developer should discuss the implications directly with Scottish Water. In some circumstances, it may be necessary for the developer to fund works on existing infrastructure to enable their development to connect.
(b) A totally separate drainage system will be required with the surface water discharging to a suitable outlet.

2.15 **Council Contaminated Land Officer**: No objections.

2.16 **Council Environmental Standards**: No objections.

### 3 REPRESENTATIONS

**Objection (5):**

John Clark, Steilston Farm, Stepford Road, Dumfries
Mrs Gail Currie, Innisfree, Cargen Grove, Cargen, Dumfries
David Fallas, 8A Rothchell Park, Dumfries, on Behalf of Mr O'Hagan Garroch Farmhouse
David Fallas, 8A Rothchell Park, Dumfries, on behalf of Mr O'Hagan, Value Mark Furniture & Lighting
John M Niven, Cargenglen, The Glen, Dumfries

3.1 The grounds of objection are summarised as follows:-
(a) Embankments along eastern boundary are overlarge and would affect residential / visual amenity.
(b) Land use conflict between hospital use and business / industrial use.
(c) Road safety relating to Garroch Farm / Value Mark business use.
(d) Adverse impact on residential amenity.
(e) Site is not sustainable and would result in an increase in vehicle movements from existing site.
(f) Conflict with route of southern bypass.
(g) Road user conflict between hospital visitors / staff and Glen Road residents. A mini-roundabout, give-way or priority system should be considered.
(h) Conflict with blue light traffic and Glen Rd residents (including use of Blue Light access by general traffic).
(i) Parking along Glen Road
(j) Increase in pressure for housing development in the area.
(k) Increase in volume of traffic on Beeches Road, due to extra traffic from the New Abbey area.
(l) Impact of staff residencies on Cargenbridge Primary School and Nursery, if families reside in them.
(m) Scale and extent of disruption during site construction and road improvements.

[NB - Matters raised which are not material planning considerations include notification process; planning policy ambiguity; concern relating to potential for unplanned and opportunistic residential development in the area.]

3.2 For the purposes of clarity, it should be noted that two of the above representors offer broad support for the proposed hospital, but ask for their detailed points of concern to be taken on board.

Support (1):
Messrs WM & D Muir, Starryheugh Farm, Castle Douglas Road, Dumfries

3.3 The grounds of support are summarised as follows:
(a) Preference for the site to be used for the proposed hospital rather than remain as agricultural land or be used for other purposes such as industry.

4 REPORT

Relevant development plan policies:

Dumfries & Galloway Structure Plan
C5 - Location of Health & Social Welfare Facilities
D27 - Development of Agriculture
D36 - Design of Development
D37 - Private Sector Contributions
D38 - Environmental Assessment & Monitoring
E2 - Regional Scenic Areas
E3 - Landscape Character
E11 - Historic Gardens & Designed Landscapes
E9 - Listed Buildings
S4 - Location of Development

Nithsdale Local Plan
General Policy 1 - Development Principle
General Policy 2 - Development Considerations
General Policy 3 - Settlement Boundaries
General Policy 7 - Siting & Design
General Policy 8 - Overdevelopment of Sites
General Policy 25 - Established Business & Industrial Areas
General Policy 42 - Regional Scenic Areas
General Policy 51 - Listed Buildings
General Policy 57 - Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS)
General Policy 58 - Flood Risk & Development
General Policy 60 - Water Sewerage & Drainage Provision
General Policy 65 - Traffic Management & Road Safety
Material considerations include:-
Scottish Planning Policy (2010)
Proposed Local Development Plan consultation draft (2013)
Dumfries and Galloway Landscape Assessment (1998)

4.1 Section 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, as amended by the Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006, requires that: “Where, in making any determination under the planning Acts, regard is to be had to the development plan, the determination is, unless material considerations indicate otherwise, to be made in accordance with that plan”.

4.2 When determining applications, the Council is required to consider the overall aims and objectives of the development plan as well the above subject policies. The guiding principle of the Dumfries & Galloway Structure Plan is to encourage the growth and development of sustainable communities in Dumfries & Galloway. To achieve this, the following aims have been set out for the Structure Plan:-
- To support development of the local economy
- To support urban and rural communities
- To support and protect the natural and built environment
- To make best use of services and facilities

4.3 Scottish Planning Policy promotes sustainable development and sustainable economic growth. In doing so, decisions on the location of new development should promote regeneration and the re-use of previously developed land, reduce the need to travel and prioritise sustainable travel and transport opportunities, promote the development of mixed communities, take account of the capacity of existing infrastructure, promote rural development and regeneration, and prevent further development which would be at risk from flooding.

4.4 The proposal offers a significant opportunity in terms of these overarching objectives; the development of a new regional hospital would offer improved access to health provision for the regional community, both urban and rural; it would support development of the local economy and promote wider regeneration for Dumfries; and finally, the Environmental Statement has demonstrated that the natural and built environment would be adequately protected through design and mitigation.

4.5 In considering these key principles, the determining issues are:-
- Principle of development
- Transport and accessibility
- Layout, design and landscaping
- Cultural heritage
- Ecology
Principle of development

4.6 Structure Plan Policy C5 states that when considering proposals or planning the location of new facilities, the Council will take into account the following; (1) sites should meet the needs of local client groups; (2) sites should be within or adjacent to an established settlement; (3) sites should be easily accessed by a range of transport modes, pedestrian, public and private; and (4) where appropriate, the development will have easy access to supplementary healthcare facilities.

4.7 In respect of the first criterion, the 'local' client group is considered in this case to be the general population of Dumfries and Galloway. The Environmental Statement notes that the applicant has undergone an extensive site selection process which included public consultation over the course of three months, seeking views of preferred locations for the new hospital development (the five sites put forward were Garroch, Summerfield, Heathhall, Locharbriggs, and the existing DGRI at Bankend Road). The consultation involved public drop-in sessions, meetings with groups and organisations, and surveys, in a process approved by the Scottish Health Council, and received 3670 responses with 55% expressing a preference for the Garroch site. With regard to the second criterion, the site lies immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary of Dumfries. The third criterion, the accessibility of the site, is considered to be acceptable, as discussed in detail below. Finally, compliance with the fourth criterion is not required; the proposed hospital is designed with specific focus on clinical adjacencies.

4.8 General Policies 1 and 25 aim to protect adjacent land uses from development that would cause land use conflict or be incompatible with it, with particular regard to the adjacent established business and industrial site. It is appropriate that this established use should not be prohibited from carrying out normal operations specifically as a result of the more sensitive hospital use. The ES states that hospital can be designed to ensure, with mitigation, that all uses can operate without conflict. This mitigation includes provision of tree planting and landscape bunding along the eastern boundary with the industrial estate. Appropriate siting of the more sensitive accommodation can also offer benefits, for example the In-Patient Accommodation Blocks are between 200m and 350m away from the industrial uses, with intervening buildings, car parking and landscaping. Whilst no Noise Impact Assessment has been provided at this stage, the Environmental Standards Officer raises no objection.

4.9 The south-eastern corner of the site lies within the outer and middle zones of an Health and Safety Executive (HSE) consultation area in respect of the adjacent DuPont site. This site is identified as such as a result of a Hazardous Substances Consent (Ref 01/P/3/0015) that was issued in 2001 for the siting of flammable liquids used in the manufacture of polyester chips and polyester film. Consultation with HSE has indicated that the more sensitive hospital building should not be located within the consultation zone, but that parking, access roads, staff residencies and the energy centre could be.
4.10 The ES carries out a risk assessment process for potential land use conflicts with adjacent uses, by identifying perceived risks, identifying management / mitigation measures, assigning severity and likelihood ratings and, finally, evaluating the risk. Seven key risks are identified, five of which are assessed as low. The two greatest risks, assessed as medium, relate to failure of the cooling towers at DuPont with subsequent outbreak of Legionella. This risk should be considered in context; the risk is of extreme severity but of rare likelihood, and the neighbouring properties have existed for several decades without major incident. Furthermore, it is indicated that this risk will be subject to regular monitoring by SEPA. No objection has been received in this respect from HSE, SEPA or the Council's Environmental Standards Officer. That NHS D&G, as the statutory health authority providers to the region, have assessed these risks as acceptable as part of their Business Continuity Plan for the proposed site, is also a material consideration of some weight. Accordingly, in planning terms, it is considered that the hospital and the business and industrial uses can co-exist, subject to the proposed mitigation.

4.11 Structure Plan Policy D4 supports the provision of residential accommodation in the countryside where it can be shown to be essential at that location. Notwithstanding that the construction of the hospital would negate the countryside status of the site, the provision of ancillary staff residences at hospitals is not uncommon across the UK. The residences are accepted as necessary to the development, particularly in light of the remoteness of the site from residential development and the below assessment of sustainable transport, subject to an appropriate occupancy condition. NHS D&G have advised that the proposed staff residences would provide an indicative 104 single rooms, and that these would be used mainly by student / trainee doctors for short durations. It is not envisaged that couples or families would live in the residences. The concern in respect of the potential impact upon the local Cargenbridge Primary School and Nursery is therefore unlikely to arise.

Transport and accessibility
4.12 The Council has a number of policies that relate to traffic generation and road safety. Policy C5 (Location of Health and Social Welfare Facilities) states that when considering proposals for new facilities, sites should be easily accessed by a range of transport modes. General Policy 2 (Development Considerations) states that developers will be required to satisfy the planning authority in respect of traffic generation onto the adjacent road network, and General Policy 65 (Traffic Management and Road Safety) states that the Council will seek to improve road safety through the use of traffic management and traffic calming measures. To address traffic/pedestrian conflicts and other road safety issues, developers will be required to incorporate measure to reduce pedestrian, vehicle and cycle conflict.

4.13 The NHS has submitted a Transport Assessment (TA) in support of the proposal. This provides a detailed assessment of the existing road network serving the site and the impact of the proposed development. It considers the transport policy context, an overview of movement and transport, an accessibility assessment, traffic surveys and a study of key junctions, trip generation and distribution, traffic growth and committed developments (based on the Nithsdale Local Plan), strategic and detailed modelling assessment, and modelling results. A number of recommendations have been made, relating to Trunk Road improvements, parking, public transport, cycling and pedestrian access.
**Trunk Road Improvements**

4.14 The TA notes that the proposed site is well located to make use of both the strategic and local road network and, as a result, a higher volume of the population can access the proposed site more easily by car. The main traffic impacts of the proposal are on the trunk road, with growth in traffic in excess of 10%.

4.15 The following trunk road improvements are recommended:-

- **A75 / Garroch Loaning roundabout.** Increase in diameter of roundabout, new spur to serve the hospital and Glen Road, and alterations to geometry on all other spurs.
- **A75 / Glasgow Road roundabout.** Adjustments to flare on three approaches.
- **A75 / Edinburgh Road roundabout.** Minor adjustments to flare on two approaches.
- **A75 / Lockerbie Road roundabout.** Minor adjustments to flare on two approaches.

4.16 The improvements at A75 / Garroch Loaning roundabout are clearly required in order to serve the proposed development, and the work on these requires to be completed prior to the occupation of the proposed hospital. This is recommended to be conditioned accordingly.

4.17 The improvements at A75 / Glasgow Road roundabout are less significant, but are proposed in order to deal with the increase in traffic and the capacity of the junction. The improvements at A75 / Edinburgh Road roundabout and A75 / Lockerbie Road roundabout would only require minor adjustments, of 1m or so, to the flare of the approach to the roundabout. The TA suggests that the actual benefit to be gained, in terms of improved traffic movements at these junctions, is likely to be minor, particularly given the disruption involved in implementing the works.

4.18 NHS D&G, the Council, and Transport Scotland have been involved in detailed ongoing discussions regarding implementation of the proposed trunk road improvements. Transport Scotland are agreeable to the concept of a commuted sum in lieu of the work on these three roundabouts, to be paid towards more general improvements along the Dumfries bypass. NHS D&G are also agreeable to this. The Council Strategy and Transportation Officer considers that the A75 / Glasgow Road roundabout works are worth implementing, and that a commuted sum in respect of the remaining two roundabouts should be used to build in further improvements here. However, no final agreement has yet been reached between Transport Scotland and NHS D&G and, in order to allow this application to progress, conditions are recommended requiring implementation of all works to all roundabouts. Some flexibility has been built in to the recommended conditions in order to allow for alternative arrangements, should agreement be reached at a future date.

**Local Road Network Improvements**

4.19 The TA considers that the 10% growth in traffic on the trunk road will be offset through a reduction in traffic flows in the centre of Dumfries in the vicinity of the existing DGRI. The TA assesses the local road network, and concludes that no improvements are required.

4.20 However, the Council’s Strategy and Transportation Officer has provided a detailed consultation response in respect of the Transport Assessment and reaches the conclusion that two key local road improvements are required as a result of the development:-
- Pleasance Avenue / New Abbey Road. A roundabout is recommended to replace the existing T-junction.
- Park Road / Dalbeattie Road. Re-prioritisation of the existing priority to Dalbeattie Road is recommended.

4.21 The TA states that the overall capacity of these junctions will not be increased (i.e. the total number of vehicle movements per day remains approximately the same), and therefore no improvements are required. This element of the TA is not significantly disputed; the overall number of vehicles over a given day is unlikely to increase.

4.22 However, the Council’s Strategy and Transportation Officer has analysed the TA in detail, and considers that it is not robust enough for NHS D&G to rely solely on its conclusions without taking a wider and more pragmatic approach. The officer considers that, whilst overall capacity remains the same, traffic flows along Pleasance Avenue at particular times are likely to increase by around 11%. There is some concern that this increase in traffic flows could result in road safety issues at Pleasance Avenue / New Abbey Road due to driver frustration and the opportunity for queuing drivers to attempt to ‘rat-run’ through Broomlands or Rotchell. These areas are residential areas which also form part of the Safer Routes to Schools serving Troqueer Primary School, and have already been subject to a number of road re-prioritisation and speed restriction measures to reduce the inclination to ‘rat-run’. There are no further measures that could be introduced. As a result, the recommended option is to provide a roundabout at the New Abbey Road junction, and thereby reduce queuing. The TA does not provide traffic modelling results for Park Road / Dalbeattie Road. However, it is reasonable to assume that the increase in traffic flows would be of similar magnitude to that along Pleasance Avenue, thus the suggested improvements.

4.23 As a result of the above considerations, the two identified junction improvements are considered to be desirable for a number of reasons, including:-
- To ensure appropriate road safety as a result of increased traffic flows;
- To ensure that a key ‘blue light’ route between the town centre and the proposed hospital is appropriately protected;
- To reduce rat-running through established residential areas, and the Safer Routes to Schools areas for Troqueer Primary School;
- The improved road network would reduce queue times for bus services, making them more reliable and efficient, thereby encouraging more sustainable transport; &
- To ensure appropriate transport routes between the proposed hospital and the residual medical facilities at the Crichton (Cresswell, Mid-park, Crichton Hall, Dental surgery, Nithbank).

4.24 The Council has noted the potential for safety improvements at these locations for a number of years, but they have never been prioritised as part of any capital spending programme. The requirement to implement the works has now been brought forward and, on 12 March 2013, the Planning Housing and Environment Services Committee agreed to fund these road improvements on the basis of a 50/50 cost share with NHS D&G. This arrangement, and the implementation of the improvement works, is recommended to be secured by means of a legal agreement.
4.25 Representations have been made in respect of increased congestion on the Glen Road and potential conflict with blue-light traffic, and provision of a roundabout has been suggested instead of a T-junction. Whilst it is clear that traffic levels would increase substantially in this locality, it is not anticipated that this would adversely affect existing residents along the Glen Road. The use of a yellow box junction on the ghost island would ensure that a clear path is maintained for both blue light vehicles and Glen Road residents. The risk of increased traffic on Beeches Road, Carruchan Beeches and Moss Road has been considered, and the transport consultants have predicted that there would be a negligible change in flow along both the A710 and A711 as a result of the hospital move (less than 5% change in traffic flow at peak times during opening year of the hospital). This level of variation of flow is anticipated to be less than that of day to day / seasonal variation prevalent on these routes. The access to Garroch Farm and the Value Mark building is not anticipated to be adversely affected as a result of the development. Finally, the route of the proposed full southern bypass, which is intended to meet the existing road network just south of the viaduct on Garroch Loaning, would remain unaffected by the proposed hospital.

Parking
4.26 The Council's draft parking provision guidelines set out minimum parking standards for hospitals and, taking green travel plan reductions into account, these guidelines recommend provision of a minimum of 619 parking spaces. The TA has undertaken further parking analysis for the proposed Garroch site, and it is expected that parking demand at Garroch would reach approximately 960 spaces in a worst case scenario. The TA concludes that parking provision should be set at a level of 960 spaces (907 general, 53 disabled), with 80 cycle spaces. The proposal incorporates a total of 980 car parking spaces, with 80 cycle spaces. Whilst this represents a slight overprovision, these figures have been reviewed as acceptable by the Council's roads officers.

4.27 The TA also outlines a parking strategy for the proposed site, to form part of the proposed Travel Plan. The parking strategy acknowledges the risk of staff arriving first and taking up spaces closest to the entrances, thereby increasing walking distances for visitors and reducing the turnover of spaces. It suggests surveying and analysing parking patterns at the existing site, with a view to creating parking zones on the proposed site and providing enforcement mechanisms to avoid overspill onto the local road network.

Public transportation (buses)
4.28 A public bus service would be required to serve the hospital, and it is expected that any new service would need to equal or be better than the service to the existing DGRI Bankend Road. The TA notes that the bus service should enter the site to be within an acceptable walking distance (400m) and, accordingly, bus stops are indicatively located at the main entrance. This new service would be subsidised by NHS D&G, by means of a legal agreement, on a reducing subsidy model. This would allow reduced contributions where target passenger numbers are met, based on pre-identified triggers. The TA suggest that there would be little difference between the existing and proposed sites, in terms of the effectiveness of a bus service. Whilst the existing site is accessible to more people by public transport in less than 25 minutes, a similar number can access both sites within 45 minutes. The Council Sustainable Travel Officer is satisfied with this arrangement.
Cycling and pedestrian access

4.29 The Garroch site is outwith acceptable walking distances. It is isolated from residential areas, the train station and the town centre, and the TA acknowledges that the existing DGRI site is more accessible by walking than the proposed site. It notes that a population of just 163 people live within 15 minutes walk of the proposed site, with 1,144 within the same distance from the existing site. This aspect of the proposed siting is therefore at odds with the overarching support for sustainable transport modes, with particular emphasis on pedestrian access, as set out in both national policy and development plan policy.

4.30 In terms of cycle accessibility, the TA claims that the Garroch site is within a reasonable cycling time (15-20 minutes) of the main part of the town including virtually all areas within the A75 bypass. The Council Strategy and Transportation Officer notes, correctly, that this overestimates the potential for cycling; in reality, this time period only just reaches the town centre. Notwithstanding this, the Garroch Business Park is already served by good cycling links, by means of the Park Road / Garroch Loaning cycle path and the Maxwelltown cycle path (which is separately being upgraded with lighting). In addition, NHS D&G have agreed to provision of an extension to the existing Park Road / Garroch Loaning cycle path. This indicatively extends via Park Road and New Abbey Road to Broomlands, linking thereafter with the existing cycle route to Troqueer and beyond to Georgetown. This is to be secured by a legal agreement.

4.31 The remoteness of the site to both pedestrians and cyclists is, to some extent, partially offset by the improvement to already good cycling links. Given the overarching benefits of the scheme, this is not considered sufficient reason for refusal of the application.

Encouraging sustainable transport

4.32 The TA recommends submission of a Travel Plan, and this is supported by Transport Scotland, the Council Strategy and Transportation Officer and the Council Roads Officer. It is intended that this document should include provision of a NHS D&G management scheme to promote behavioural change to reduce car usage, and a detailed parking management strategy, as well as identifying a dedicated travel plan co-ordinator.

Layout, design and landscaping

Layout and design

4.33 Notwithstanding that the application is for planning permission in principle, Policy D36 and General Policies 1 and 7 require development have regard to the character and appearance, scale, density, massing and materials, of the building, group of buildings or adjacent area of which it will form a part; have no material adverse effect on the local landscape character, avoiding prominent ridge lines or other visually sensitive sites; and have regard to the need for energy conservation and efficiency in the design, orientation and layout of the site or buildings. An indicative layout and design has been submitted, in the form of the reference design.

4.34 The reference design for the building has been reached as a result of the need to consider clinical adjacencies, and this relates to site layout as well, with particular elements requiring particular locations on site. The submitted Design Statement provides
evidence of the rigour of the iterative and ongoing design process for this proposal. The main entrance faces the visitor on entry to the site. A&E would clearly benefit from close proximity to the road, with its own blue light access, thereby avoiding potential traffic congestion across the general site. The Women and Children's Block is provided with a visually separate, but linked, building on the basis that women giving birth are not ill. The energy centre and residencies would be located to the rear of the site, as would be the kitchen and service areas which would be served by a dedicated service access. Overall, the layout is considered to be effective.

4.35 The design statement explains that the radial concept is intended to make the most of the countryside by bringing the landscape into the heart of the hospital; to use the fall of the land to help keep the building low, and to break down the massing leading to a more campus-like feel to the development. The breaking down of the hospital into recognisable areas is intended to assist wayfinding, to reassure patients and visitors with a more intimate environment, and to provide a built form that relates to the local vernacular. The building is shown as being predominantly 3 storeys in height, with pitched roofs, up to 20m in height. In terms of materials, a preference is expressed for predominantly natural materials with powder coated aluminium framed window and curtain wall systems. Proposed preferred materials include natural stone, clay facing brickwork, and concealed fix rainscreen (terracotta tile, synthetic stone, solid laminate, ceramic tile), with use of render and timber cladding limited due to weathering characteristics. This approach is broadly acceptable. No details of design have been provided for the residencies or energy centre.

Landscaping

4.36 Policy E2 requires that development which would have a significant impact upon a Regional Scenic Area should not adversely affect the landscape character and scenic interest of the designation. The current proposal is not within the designated area, and there are limited clear viewpoints of the site from within the Regional Scenic Area. Therefore, the designation is not adversely affected.

4.37 Policy E3 requires development proposals likely to have a significant impact on the landscape to take account of the Dumfries and Galloway Landscape Assessment (DGLA). The site is located on the outer edge of the Lower Dale (LCT6) and close to the boundary of the Upland Fringe (LCT16). The LVIA notes that the Lower Dale would be limited to the A75 and a few nearby receptors, with the proposal having a slight adverse impact. The Upland Fringe is would only experience even more limited views of the development, which are already impacted by the industrial estate, with the proposal having a slight adverse impact during construction, becoming negligible once operational. The Council Landscape Architect welcomes the use of tree planting and earth bunding, which could replicate the local landscape character. It is also recommended that two very prominent oak trees at the northern edge of the site be retained; this is desirable, but would depend on final ground levels across the site.

4.38 A ZTV map has been submitted to aid assessment of visual impacts up to 5km from the site. This demonstrates theoretical visibility extending to include:

- the settlement of Cargenbridge, and the western edges of Dumfries;
- Garroch Business Park;
- a 3km section of the A75(T), with intermittent visibility beyond;
- sections of other public roads to the west of Dumfries; &
- some of the more elevated hillsides within the wider locality.

The ZTV is based on topography only and, in reality, intervening landscape features such as trees, woodlands, and buildings would provide greater or lesser screening depending on context.

4.39 The LVIA considers visual impact from a number of receptors, including residential properties. Garroch View to the north is predicted to experience an effect of slight significance. However, Garroch Farm, to the eastern boundary of the application site, is predicted to experience a substantial effect. At Kilnford and Terraughtie House the effect is moderate. Terraughtie House is part of the wider Terraughtie House Non-Inventory Designed Landscape, and this designation is predicted by the LVIA to experience a moderate adverse impact. The Council's Landscape Architect disagrees with this, concluding that the effect would be high, though it is accepted that this may reduce as landscaping matures. The LVIA acknowledges that the assessment would need to be revisited as part of the detailed application, and states that the detailed design would address these findings and include all reasonable mitigation measures to minimise the effects on the above properties, including earth bunding and tree planting. Whilst representations have been made relating to overlarge bunding, it is considered that appropriate mitigation has the potential to markedly minimise negative effects in the long term. In balancing public and private interests, it is considered that the benefits of the proposal outweigh the effect to these properties.

4.40 Dwellings and settlements further afield are unlikely to experience any significant detrimental impacts due to distance, topography, and the backdrop of the Terregles ridge. The Terraughtie Core Path would experience significant changes to views over a relatively short distances, with the LVIA concluding moderate effects. The remaining receptors relate to nearby roads and footpaths, where impacts would be intermittent and partially screened by existing vegetation. These impacts are considered to be acceptable and, in all cases, the detailed design is anticipated to offer mitigation to offset these.

Conclusion

4.41 Overall, the reference design and the ES demonstrate that a building of this scale and floorspace can be acceptably accommodated on the site, in terms of layout, design and landscaping. Whilst there is a need to retain flexibility in the design, it is not anticipated that the reference design will be subject to substantive changes. The maximum building heights and massing are recommended to remain in substantial accordance with the reference design. Matters relating to site layout, detailed design of the buildings and elevations, the sensitive use of materials in the context of key views, and landscaping, are reserved for further approval.

Cultural heritage

4.42 There are no previously recorded cultural heritage assets within the application site, and it is concluded by both the ES and the Council Archaeologist that there is a low potential for archaeological finds. The category B listed building Terraughtie House is a 19th century country house, with principle elevation facing north. The eastern elevation with aspect towards the site is substantially screened by garden boundary planting, and field boundary planting beyond, such that its setting its not adversely affected.
Ecology
4.43 The application site does not form part of any statutory or non-statutory sites designated for nature conservation. The habitats on site are limited to improved grassland, dense scrub, scattered broad-leaved trees, and hedgerows. The proposal intends to retain some existing trees, subject to design constraints, to replant with native species to bolster existing tree lines and provide habitat of aesthetic and ecological value, and creation of new habitats such as the SUDS pond. A line of semi-mature sycamore trees close to the site are likely to be removed, with compensatory hawthorn hedging proposed. Species surveys have been carried out for badgers, bats, red squirrel, water vole and otters. No evidence of red squirrel, water vole or otter activity was found. The majority of the trees have suitable bat roosting features, and bats are known to be using the site for foraging. A further badger survey, with any identified mitigation, would be carried out at the detailed application stage. In terms of mitigation, it is proposed that bat roosting opportunities would be provided, and that the site be replanted with foraging vegetation. Construction works would be carried out in accordance with good practice. Overall, in terms of ecology, the impact of the proposal is considered to be minor.

Air and soil
4.44 The ES includes a section on air quality, with impacts relating principally to hospital traffic and emissions from the stack associated with the energy centre. The modelling predictions conclude that the annual average concentrations of nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and particulate matter (PM₁₀) are well below their corresponding air quality objectives, such that the impact of the development is assessed as negligible. Transport Scotland and the Council's Environmental Standards Service raise no objections.

4.45 Policy D27 states that prime quality agricultural land will be safeguarded, except where it is essential to the implementation of the Structure Plan strategy and lower quality cannot be used. The application site is predominantly located within Grade 3.1 land, which supports a moderate / above average range of crops, and the development would result in the loss of quality agricultural land. However, the proposal is considered to meet the Structure Plan strategy, as concluded elsewhere in this report, and the loss of this area of agricultural land is therefore acceptable.

Water environment
4.46 The water environment has the potential to be affected by the development in two ways; firstly, pollution of watercourses during construction and, secondly, the risk of flooding. The ES confirms that a Construction Environmental Management Plan would be produced for approval by SEPA prior to commencement of construction; it is recommended that this be required by condition.

4.47 A Flood Risk Assessment has been provided as an Addendum to the Environmental Statement. This considers flood risk in terms of both pluvial and fluvial risk. In respect of pluvial flooding, it is noted that the hospital building and car park are located on the higher parts of the site. Topography dictates that pluvial flow would be directed away from the hospital site towards the Terraughtie Burn to the south or the public road to the north. The ES concludes that pluvial flows would be dealt with by means of SUDS, rainwater harvesting, permeable paving, etc. SEPA require that a surface water management scheme be considered as part of the detailed application, to reduce the risk to surrounding land.
4.48 In terms of fluvial flow, SPP requires that essential civil infrastructure such as hospitals be considered under the low to medium risk framework, represented by a 1 in 1,000 year annual probability instead of the standard 1 in 200 year event. SPP states that where infrastructure must be located in these areas, it should remain capable of remaining operational and accessible during these extreme flooding events. The risk comes from two watercourses; the Terraughtie Burn bounding the south-west of the site, and the Cargen Water to the north of the site.

4.49 The FRA indicates that in a 1 in 200 year event, the Terraughtie Burn may flood a small section of the south-west corner of the hospital site. This relates to the area shown indicatively as a SUDS retention basin. This is naturally the lower part of the site and, given the rising land beyond, it is not considered that the 1 in 1,000 year event would prejudice the overall development of the site. Notwithstanding this, it is recommended that the 1 in 1,000 year flood envelope be calculated in order to inform the detailed layout of this corner of the site.

4.50 The hospital site is not predicted to be at risk of flooding from the Cargen Water, which runs approximately 500m to the north of the site. However, in both a 1 in 1,000 and a 1 in 200 year event, this watercourse creates an existing risk of flooding to the A75 trunk road (from north-west of Garroch View to just beyond the A75/A780 Castle Douglas Road roundabout) and the A711 at the Cargen Bridge. Whilst this risk would not change as a result of the development, it does present the potential scenario that the hospital site may not be accessible from these two main routes from Dumfries in an extreme event. As a result, NHS D&G have provided a draft contingency plan that would involve alternative routes to the proposed site from the A75/Lochfoot roundabout, via Terregles to the north and the Old Military Road to the south. Both SEPA and the Council’s Flood Management Team are satisfied that this contingency plan represents a viable alternative road access to the site. The proposal is therefore considered to meet the SPP requirement that essential civil infrastructure remains operational and accessible during a 1 in 1,000 year flood event. As a separate consideration, NHS D&G have undertaken to carry out a FRA of the Cargen Water to identify the actual level of disruption to the A75 associated with a 1 in 1,000 year fluvial flood event. This would inform the emergency planning response - distinct from this land use planning response - to flood events, i.e. alternative road access routes and helicopter access.

Servicing
4.51 The proposed development would be served by means of connection to a public water supply and drainage network. Scottish Water have no objections to the proposal, but it may be necessary for NHS D&G to carry out works on the local network to facilitate this.

4.52 An indicative SUDS scheme is proposed, in the form of a retention pond at the lowest part of the site. The ES confirms that such a scheme could be readily accommodated on the site and the detailed design of the SUDS, along with a scheme for future maintenance, would be matters for further approval.

Residential amenity
4.53 General Policy 1 has a presumption against development which would materially detract from or be incompatible with the amenity of the locality. It is appropriate to consider residential amenity in terms of visual dominance and noise. Visual dominance on
individual properties has been assessed above as being acceptable.

4.54 In terms of noise, there are three potential impacts; noise during construction and, once operational, noise from routine operations of the hospital and noise from traffic accessing the site. The ES states that, because the application is for the principle of development, the potential for noise and vibration during construction cannot be fully characterised at this stage as the construction method is not known. Instead potential impacts, and any necessary mitigations, would be subject to detailed consideration as part of any detailed planning application. Noise from typical day to day hospital activities is not considered to be an issue, as the hospital itself is considered to be a noise sensitive environment and hence all efforts would be undertaken to control and minimise noise. The potential noise impact from predicted traffic has been assessed, with baseline monitoring carried out at four residential receptors at Garroch View, Garroch Farmhouse, Westhill and Kilnford Barns. This concluded that the significance of impact at Garroch View and Garroch Farm would be slight, with neutral impact on Westhill and Kilnford Barns, and no further mitigation is proposed at this stage. Noise from helicopters landing and taking off at the helipad would be limited to emergencies. The Council's Environmental Standards Officer is content with this approach, recommending that a full Noise Impact Assessment be carried out as part of any detailed application.

**Cumulative impacts**

4.55 The assessment of cumulative impacts is required by environmental legislation and, in this instance, cumulative effects could potentially occur in three distinct ways; firstly, with other developments that are planned or committed, secondly, with existing operations and, thirdly, due to the interaction of a combination of predicted effects. The ES concludes that no significant cumulative impacts have been identified, and that any negative cumulative effects are minor and relate to the initial construction works. However, mitigation measures would be proposed, such as best construction practice / techniques, as part of the Construction Environmental Management Plan.

**Other material considerations**

4.56 Concern has been raised relating to potential increase in pressure for housing development around the hospital, once operational. If this proves to be the case, then the timescales involved would allow for this to be properly assessed and considered as part of the next formal Local Development Plan process (the hospital would not open to patients until 2018, i.e. after the currently proposed plan period).

4.57 Representations have also been made in respect of disturbance during construction works. This would not normally be a material consideration in respect of a planning application. However, the scale of the construction works merits consideration in respect of environmental legislation. Accordingly, the ES includes a chapter on Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). It notes that there are a number of potential site specific environmental impacts could lead to negative environmental impacts, if unchecked. A draft Construction Environmental Management Plan is included, which sets out roles and responsibilities for leading on all environmental matters, sets out mitigation measures to protect local residents and habitats, ensures appropriate staff are adequately trained and aware of the CEMP, provides implementation guidelines and sets out monitoring requirements.
4.58 The Proposed Local Development Plan is currently a consultation draft only; it is subject to change, and is of very limited weight as a material consideration presently. However, given the potential wider implications of this proposal on the long term strategy for Dumfries, it is appropriate to bear the proposed plan in mind. Proposed Policy CF1a (Provision of Community Facilities) relates to the provision of new hospital facilities. The site itself is allocated for an extension to the established and allocated business and industrial land, as DFS.B&I3 (Garroch Loaning). Finally, the Proposed Plan provides commentary on the possible relocation of DGRI, acknowledging DFS.B&I3 as NHS D&G's preferred site. It notes that funding has yet to be agreed, that the development would take many years to complete, and that once complete the vacant part of the existing hospital site would become available for development which is likely to be part of a wider masterplanning exercise for the Crichton Quarter. Overall, the Proposed Local Development Plan does not raise any inconsistencies in terms of the above assessment against current development plan policies.

Conclusion
4.59 The development of a new regional hospital in Dumfries offers significant opportunities; firstly, it would offer improved access to health provision for the regional community; secondly, it would support development of the local economy and promote wider regeneration for Dumfries.

4.60 The proposal would result in a number of transport initiatives. Along the A75 trunk road, a new roundabout would be provided at the A75 / Garroch Loaning roundabout, and improvement works are proposed at the A75 / Glasgow Road roundabout, the A75 / Edinburgh Road roundabout and the A75 / Lockerbie Road roundabout. On the local road network, improvements are proposed at the Pleasance Avenue / New Abbey Road junction and the Park Road / Dalbeattie Road junction. Contributions would provide a bus service equal to or better than the existing service to DGRI Bankend Road; and the existing cycleway along Park Road would be extended. Whilst the site is isolated from residential areas and is outwith acceptable walking distances, this would be partially offset by the improved cycling links.

4.61 The 'reference design' for planning permission in principle offers a design concept that intends to make the most of the countryside by bringing the landscape into the heart of the hospital. It demonstrates that the application site can accommodate a development of this scale and floorspace, without significant adverse impact on local amenity or the wider landscape. No issues have arisen in terms of cultural heritage, ecology, air quality, soil and water environment, or servicing, that cannot be satisfactorily addressed as part of any detailed application. The Environmental Statement has demonstrated that the natural and built environment would be adequately protected through design and mitigation.

4.62 The proposed development is considered to be in accordance with the requirements of the development plan and, in the absence of any material considerations to indicate otherwise, is acceptable. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval, subject to conditions and legal agreement.
5 RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Approve subject to the successful completion of a Section 69 legal agreement and the following conditions:-

1. a) That this planning permission in principle will expire three years from the date of this permission unless further application(s) for all of the matters specified in conditions below have been submitted to the planning authority within that time period;
   b) That development in accordance with this planning permission in principle must be commenced within three years of the date of this permission, or within two years of the final approval of matters specified in the conditions below (whichever is later of these two dates).

2. That no development in respect of this planning permission in principle shall take place unless further application(s), accompanied by plans showing all the matters specified in Conditions 3 to 6 below, have been submitted to and approved by the Council as planning authority.

3. Layout: This shall include:-
   (a) Position of the hospital and all other ancillary buildings, structures and uses within the site, in broad accordance with KEP-G(90)X-XX-03 (Site Plan - Proposed),
   (b) Contours and cross-sections of the site showing a datum point and final floor levels of the hospital and all other ancillary buildings and structures, in broad accordance with KEP-G(90)X-XX-01 (Sections),
   (c) Layout, position, geometry, dimensions, levels and surfacing of all vehicular and pedestrian accesses (to the A75, U347n and U350n public roads), internal roads, footpaths, cycleways, car parking and cycle parking, and details of the location and design of pedestrian prioritised crossing facilities,
   (d) Layout, position, dimensions, levels and surfacing of the helipad, with mitigation measures incorporated along the site boundary with the U350n public road to reduce risk of distraction to road users,
   (e) Details of bus access and bus stop provision within the site,
   (f) The layout and configuration of all external spaces including internal courtyards demonstrating the extent and means of public access,
   (g) Existing and proposed services such as cables, pipelines and substations,
   (h) Details of foul and surface water drainage scheme, including SUDS and a surface water management scheme (to identify flow pathways and recommend management measures to reduce the risk to the hospital and surrounding land), for the site and any proposed adoptable road.

4. Design: This shall include plans, sections and elevations of all buildings and any other structures. The finished building height and massing for the hospital building shall be substantively in accordance with the details shown in drawings KEP-G(00)X-SE-01 (Sections) and KEP-G(00)X-B1-02,
5. **External Appearance**: This shall include a specification of the colour and type of all materials to be used on walls, roofs, windows, doors, rainwater goods and any other external finishes to the building. The external appearance shall be informed by the full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment as required by Condition 7 below, and incorporate the use of recessive, non-reflective colours and materials on areas of elevations that may be seen over long views.

6. **Landscaping**: This shall show the treatment of land (including any green roofing) forming part of the site, including planting of new trees and shrubs, grassed areas, hedges, retained trees and other retained vegetation, details of level changes, hard surfacing, erection of walls, fences or other means of enclosure, formation of banks, terraces or other earthworks and the layout of gardens, courts, and other amenity features designed to provide a landscape setting for the development. The said landscaping scheme shall be informed by the full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment as required by Condition 7 below, and incorporate the following features and information:

   (i) The use of tree planting and earth bunding, both as screening and to soften the visual impact of the development, in broad accordance with the indicative layout shown on drawing numbers KEP-G(90)X-XX-03 (Site Plan - Proposed) and KEP-G(00)X-SE-01 (Sections),
   (ii) Details of the alignment, scale and form of the above earthworks, to reflect local landscape character and landforms,
   (iii) An assessment of existing trees and potential for retention, with particular consideration of the two oak trees to the front (northern) end of the site,
   (iv) Retention and/or reinstatement of existing boundary hedgerows,
   (v) The use of tree planting to enhance the local environment including car parking areas and access routes,
   (vi) New tree and shrub planting to be of native Scottish species of local origin,
   (vii) Details of other artefacts and structures such as street furniture, lighting columns, any shelters and covered walkways, play equipment, and public art,
   (viii) The programme for completion of landscaping and subsequent maintenance.

Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in full accordance with the landscaping scheme and timetable as may be so approved.

7. That the application required by Condition 2 above shall be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment (1 in 1,000 year flood risk event) of the Terraughtie Burn, and by all additional surveys / assessments recommended by the Environmental Statement and supplementary documentation, dated January 2013, and Addendum, dated March 2013,
including (but not limited to): Air Quality Assessment; Protected Species Surveys; Contaminated Land / Groundwater Phase 2 Site Assessment; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment; & Noise Impact Assessment. The layout, design, external materials and landscaping of the development required by Conditions 3, 4, 5 and 6 above shall be designed in accordance with the recommendations of the said surveys / assessments. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in full accordance with the details and mitigations as may be so approved.

8. That **no development in respect of this planning permission shall take place** unless details of the phasing of the construction of the development, including the energy centre and staff residences, have been submitted to and approved by the planning authority. Thereafter, the development shall proceed in accordance with the approved plan, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.

9. That **no development in respect of this planning permission shall take place** until a scheme for the enlargement of the Garroch Roundabout, the realignment of the existing Glen Road, the stopping-up of the existing Glen Road junction and provision of a new DGRI access road leg to the south of the roundabout has been submitted and approved in writing by the planning authority (in consultation with Transport Scotland). The said scheme shall be as generally illustrated in drawing number AA3322/SK/08 Rev D entitled ‘Junction 1 Garroch Loaning / A75 Roundabout Proposed Mitigation’ by Asher Associates. The **development hereby granted planning permission shall not be occupied or brought into use** unless the said scheme has been fully implemented as may be so approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the planning authority (in consultation with Transport Scotland).

10. That **no development in respect of this planning permission shall take place** until a scheme for modifications to the A76(T) Glasgow Road / A75(T) roundabout, as generally illustrated in drawing number AA3322/G/233 Rev A entitled ‘Junction 3 Glasgow Road / A75 Roundabout Construction Requirements’ by Asher Associates, has been submitted and approved in writing by the planning authority (in consultation with Transport Scotland), unless otherwise agreed in writing by the planning authority (in consultation with Transport Scotland). The **development hereby granted planning permission shall not be occupied or brought into use** unless the said scheme has been fully implemented as may be so approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the planning authority (in consultation with Transport Scotland).

11. That **no development in respect of this planning permission shall take place** until a scheme for modifications to the A701(T) Edinburgh Road / A75(T) roundabout, as generally illustrated in drawing number AA3322/G/243 entitled ‘Junction 4 Edinburgh Road / A75 Roundabout
Construction Requirements’ by Asher Associates, has been submitted and approved in writing by the planning authority (in consultation with Transport Scotland), unless otherwise agreed in writing by the planning authority (in consultation with Transport Scotland). The **development hereby granted planning permission shall not be occupied or brought into use** unless the said scheme has been fully implemented as may be so approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the planning authority (in consultation with Transport Scotland).

12. That **no development in respect of this planning permission shall take place** until a scheme for modifications to the A709 Lockerbie Road / A75(T) roundabout, as generally illustrated in drawing number AA3322/G/283 entitled ‘Junction 5 Lockerbie Road / A75 Roundabout Construction Requirements’ by Asher Associates, has been submitted and approved in writing by the planning authority (in consultation with Transport Scotland), unless otherwise agreed in writing by the planning authority (in consultation with Transport Scotland). The **development hereby granted planning permission shall not be occupied or brought into use** unless the said scheme has been fully implemented as may be so approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the planning authority (in consultation with Transport Scotland).

13. That **the development hereby granted planning permission shall not be occupied** until a comprehensive Travel Plan that (i) sets out proposals for reducing dependency on the private car and (ii) sets out a parking management strategy for the development, has been submitted and approved in writing by the planning authority (in consultation with Transport Scotland and the local roads authority). The Travel Plan shall be in broad accordance with the measures set out in the Transport Assessment by MVA dated December 2012, and shall incorporate measures to be implemented, phasing of implementation, system of management, monitoring, review and reporting, duration of the plan, and identification of a dedicated travel plan co-ordinator. The said scheme shall be fully implemented as may be so approved.

14. That **primary vehicular access to the development hereby granted planning permission shall not be taken from any point other than A75 Garroch roundabout. No development in respect this planning permission shall take place** unless and until a scheme for managing the access of traffic to the secondary access to the U350n Garroch Business Park has been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority (in consultation with the roads authority). The **development hereby granted planning permission shall not be occupied or brought into use** unless such scheme as may be so approved has been implemented and is fully operational.

15. That **the development hereby granted planning permission shall not be occupied or brought into use** unless it has been served by a properly
surfaced and adequately drained carriageway and footway or footpath within the site boundary to the satisfaction of the planning authority.

16. That **no development in respect of this planning permission shall take place** unless a scheme of public street lighting scheme for the proposed new primary access road, from the A75 Trunk Road to the development site boundary, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority (in consultation with the roads authority). The said scheme shall include details of the number, type and location of the proposed street lights and the phasing of their installation. The **development hereby granted planning permission shall not be occupied or brought into use** unless such scheme as may be so approved has been implemented and is fully operational.

17. That **no development in respect of this planning permission shall take place** until a comprehensive Traffic Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority (in consultation with Transport Scotland and the local roads authority). The Traffic Management Plan shall incorporate details of (a) traffic management measures including accommodation works to manage construction traffic, (b) measures to minimise traffic impacts on existing road users, (c) details of construction vehicle routing and (d) details of temporary and permanent directional signage including timetables for implementation. The said scheme shall be fully implemented as may be so approved.

18. That **no development in respect of this planning permission shall take place** unless a Construction Environmental Management Plan / Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority (in consultation with SNH, SEPA, Transport Scotland, the local roads authority and the Council’s Environmental Standards Service). The said Plan / Statement shall include (but not be limited to) the matters identified in the draft Construction Environmental Management Plan, and the following matters:-
(a) details of proposed temporary site compound for storage of materials, machinery, and designated car parking,
(b) details of any blasting of stone resulting from levelling of the site,
(c) details of pollution control, protection of water courses, bunding of fuel storage areas, surface water drainage, flood risk, sewage disposal and discharge of foul drainage,
(d) details of tree, habitat and species protection,
(e) details of construction and surface treatment of hardstandings and tracks,
(f) details of on-site storage of materials,
(g) details of on-site storage and off-site disposal of excavated material,
(h) details and timetable for post construction restoration/reinstatement of the temporary working areas,
(i) details and timetable for phasing of construction works,
(j) details of turning arrangements for vehicles on site,  
(k) cleaning of site entrance, site tracks and the adjacent public road, and  
the sheeting of all HGVs taking spoil or construction materials to/from the  
site to prevent spillage or deposit of any materials on the public road,  
(l) details of internal track construction, including any floating road  
construction,  
(m) details of reinstatement of temporary works,  
(n) noise, vibration and lighting during construction.  
Thereafter, the construction of the development shall be carried out in  
complete accordance with the Plan / Statement as may be so approved.  

19. That the development shall be constructed and thereafter operated in full  
and strict accordance with the details included within the Environmental  
Statement and supplementary documents, dated January 2013, and the  
Addendum, dated March 2013, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the  
planning authority or unless otherwise required by conditions attached to  
this permission.  

20. That no development in respect of this planning permission shall  
take place until full specification details of the proposed power generating  
system associated with the energy centre hereby granted planning  
permission, along with an assessment of the environmental impacts of the  
system and any necessary mitigation measures, have been submitted and  
approved in writing by the planning authority. Thereafter, the development  
shall be carried out in full accordance with the details and mitigation as  
may be so approved.  

21. That no development in respect of this planning permission shall  
take place unless details of the proposed external lighting (other than  
public street lighting required by Condition 16 above) to be installed within  
the application site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the  
planning authority. Such lighting shall be of a cowled or cut-off design so  
as to ensure that there is no light spillage above the horizontal and shall  
be sited so as not to be directed towards any adjacent residential  
properties or so as to dazzle drivers on any public road. The  
development hereby granted planning permission shall not be  
occupied or brought into use unless all such external lighting has been  
installed in full accordance with such details as may be so approved.  
Should any external light or lights within the application site be shown to  
cause a nuisance to any nearby residents or be a hazard to road safety,  
the Council as planning authority shall be allowed to require the said light  
or lights to be either removed, relocated or realigned as appropriate, for  
the lifetime of the development.  

22. That no development in respect of this planning permission shall  
take place unless a scheme to prevent nesting of seagulls on the  
buildings hereby granted planning permission has been submitted to and  
approved in writing by the planning authority (in consultation with the
Council's Environmental Standards Service). The said scheme shall include (i) details of all works, (ii) a maintenance schedule, and (iii) a timetable for implementation. The \textbf{development hereby granted planning permission shall not be occupied or brought into use} unless such scheme has been fully implemented as may be so approved.

23. That, in the event that Scottish Water declines to accept responsibility of the surface water drainage scheme (SUDS) or surface water management scheme referred to in Condition 3 above, a scheme detailing the maintenance and repair of the proposed surface water drainage infrastructure / systems for the lifetime of the development shall be submitted and approved in writing by the planning authority, \textbf{prior to the development being occupied or brought into use}. Thereafter, the scheme shall be implemented as may be so approved.

24. That the residences hereby granted planning permission shall not be occupied by any person or persons other than employees of, or service providers to or on behalf of, the National Health Service.
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